

## MARINE CORPS

To be major generals for temporary service  
from March 20, 1942

John Marston  
Alexander A. Vandegrift

## POSTMASTERS

## IOWA

R. Franklin Bogenrief, Hinton  
Anastatia E. Walsh, Larchwood.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we lift up our hearts to Thee; hear our prayer in Thy dwelling place, and when Thou hearest, forgive. Back of the call of the human soul is the King of Glory who came from the heights of an infinite throne to the crimson depths of the cross that He might put into our breasts the rhythm of unearthly peace. Enable us to touch even the rim of that other worldliness that breaks through the spirit of a narrow vision and gathers up our motives and endeavors and bears them to the throne of grace.

Oh, that the quiet, solemn influence of these days might inspire men to lay their ambitions, their opportunities, and the needs of their souls at the footstool of divine sovereignty. His profound grief burst from His lips as He looked tearfully upon the city that would soon be prostrated in the dust of the oppressor. O Thou who art clothed with the royalty of the eternities and waiting with matchless patience, lift us into the upper spaces of spiritual aspiration. At Thine altar may we rededicate ourselves to the loyal service of the Master who came to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to open the prison to them that are bound. O Thou chosen Son of the living God, fling Thy light across the soul of this sick world that it may turn to Thee, live like Thee, and work with Thee. In our blessed Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5784. An act to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein a copy of A Surgeon's Prayer in Wartime, by Col. John J. Moorehead, of the Army Medical Corps, written by him on Christmas night at the Tripler General Hospital in Honolulu.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: To revise and extend my remarks and to include some letters with reference to farm labor, and to extend my remarks with reference to the charging of fees by unions, and to include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a circular letter written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. I desire to submit two requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two resolutions by the Indianapolis Newspaper Guild; and, second, to extend my remarks and include a telegram from Katharine Hepburn, the movie actress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## WHERE IS THE MONEY GOING?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in checking the record I find that in the first 263 days of the fiscal year 1941, up to March 20, the administration has spent \$19,000,000,000, or an average of more than \$70,000,000 per day, \$2,916,666 per hour, \$48,611 per minute. On March 20, 1942, expenditures were \$138,000,000 per day, \$5,149,200 per hour, \$85,820 per minute.

If this money is for national defense and is spent wisely, the people will bear the burden without a murmur. But is it being spent wisely? Let us look at the record.

First. Excess profits on war contracts. Mr. W. S. Jack, president of Jack & Heintz, Inc., of Bedford, Ohio, makers of airplane parts, testified under oath that his company had paid out \$600,000 in bonuses during last year. Adeline Bowman, secretary to the president of this company, testified that she had received in bonuses \$18,295 for the first 10 weeks of this year. And all the money came from the Government.

Second. Nonessential expenditures: The records show that the Office of Civilian Defense has 69 sports coordinators to teach the people badminton, archery, billiards, code ball, miniature golf, marbles, bowling, bag punching, canoeing, and weight lifting.

In behalf of the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio, I raise my voice in criticism and protest against this

wasteful expenditure of money. Let us find out who is responsible for this waste and see that it is stopped immediately. [Here the gavel fell.]

## USE OF COPPER BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1942, Special Committee No. 3 of the House Committee on Military Affairs published a report of its investigations regarding the R. E. A. and copper. This report raised somewhat of a storm of criticism at that time, but I rise now to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Nelson has banned copper to the R. E. A. for the duration of the war, and has cut 3,200 tons from the allocated supplies. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the judgment of the committee has been vindicated in this respect. [Here the gavel fell.]

## SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6868) making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. 1976) which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the bill.

## TO INCREASE FLYING HOURS OF AIR PILOTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6799) to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it that the gentleman will make an explanation of the bill. There are a few suggestions that I would like to make in connection with it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to make an explanation.

The facts are these. There are a number of pilots on the civil aviation lines and the War Department is desirous of having these pilots or some of them for ferrying planes and for other purposes; therefore in order to do that without detriment to the service, the number of flying hours is increased from 85 to 100 a month. That will release, I think, about 240 pilots.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, because I think this bill should be adopted; but I would like to say to the membership, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, this bill seeks the amendment of section 401, subsections (1) (1) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act incorporated by reference the so-called Decision 83 of the National Labor Board rendered in 1934. The issue involved was in an action by the air-line pilots over wages.

In making this decision the Labor Board found that the maximum number of hours to be flown by a commercial air-line pilot in any 1 month should be 85, and it is that limitation which the bill seeks to change. It will release a number of pilots for military service. At this point, in order that the House may understand it, I want to say that the limitation of 85 hours was to prevent technological unemployment rather than to prevent unsafe conditions of operation on the air lines, and in support of that I read from the decision:

The industry is on the threshold of technological improvements which will greatly accelerate the speed of airplane travel and which may result in some technological unemployment. The increase of speed will either greatly increase the mileage covered by the pilots or materially reduce their monthly hours of employment.

There is no question but what the Army needs trained flyers and it should have them if the interest of safety will not be adversely affected. I think it is clear that the interests of safety will not be affected.

At no time has any Government agency found that the 85-hour limitation is necessary in the interest of safety. The civil air regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board provide 100 hours as the monthly maximum for pilots.

Just one thing more. When the representative of the Air Line Pilots Association was before the committee he said he did not have definite authority to make any commitments for his organization, but that the matter had been discussed, and it was not contemplated that the pilots would ask for anything other than straight time for the additional 15 hours of flying time that would be granted under the maximum that will be provided in this bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the bill is all right, and it is proper for the civilian pilots who are in the Reserve Corps to serve in this emergency. There is only one observation I care to make, however. I understand that a few of these civilian pilots, who are Reserve officers in the Army, have already been called into active service. Some of them have been called without giving adequate notice. In other words, I understand that in a few instances they were notified to report within 3 days.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is a matter which should be taken up with the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to briefly make a statement about this legislation.

The provisions of this bill, H. R. 6799, are temporary in character and operative concurrently with the prosecution of the present war. The bill does not amend any of the provisions of existing law, but it does suspend for the duration of the war the limitation contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, under which the maximum number of flying hours of air pilots is fixed at 85 hours per month.

This standard requirement of 85 flying hours per month for air pilots was fixed through a decision of the National Labor Board under date of May 10, 1934, which is identified as decision No. 83, of the National Labor Board. The provisions and terms of that decision as they affect air-line pilots were carried into statutory law by enactment of paragraph (1) of subsection (1) of section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which reads:

Every air carrier shall maintain rates of compensation, maximum hours, and other working conditions and relations of all of its pilots and copilots who are engaged in interstate air transportation within the continental United States (not including Alaska) so as to conform with decision numbered 83 made by the National Labor Board on May 10, 1934, notwithstanding any limitation therein as to the period of its effectiveness.

This bill results from the voluntary offer of the pilot members of the Air Line Pilots Association, as their contribution to the Nation's war effort, to waive this provision or law relating to monthly maximum number of flying hours and consent to flying 15 additional hours per month, or a maximum of 100 flying hours per month, under regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

During the hearings on this bill before the committee, Mr. David L. Behncke, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, stated on behalf of the pilot members of that association—

The pilots feel they want to do what they can for their country in its hour of dire need, we are willing to defer the effects of the 85-hour limitation and to fly with no limitation on flights that are purely for military purposes for the duration of the war.

Brig. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, Military Director of Civil Aviation, has stated:

The pilots are making a patriotic gesture by volunteering to work these extra hours.

Mr. Charles I. Stanton, Acting Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, has stated publicly that—

Behncke didn't act on his own but consulted the pilots' unit representatives. The pilots approved it. Verbally and in writing we have received promises of their fullest cooperation, and I am sure that we can count upon it.

The bill provides for certain flexibility with regard to the extra 15 flying hours which the pilots agree to work. Authority is given to the Civil Aeronautics Board by regulations: First, to fix the maximum number of flying hours at less than the 100 hours provided for by the bill if the Board, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy finds that, as to 1 or more air carriers, the flying of 100 hours is not re-

quired for military needs of the armed forces; and second, to authorize the flying beyond the maximum of 100 hours to such extent as may be found necessary to complete a particular flight for military purposes.

No opposition to the bill was expressed during the hearings before the committee. Unanimity of support has been expressed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Army air forces, the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy, and the Bureau of the Budget.

The early enactment of the bill is of emergency importance to the prosecution of our war efforts. The committee recommends its prompt passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the maximum flying hours in interstate air transportation prescribed by paragraph (1) of section 401 (1) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, shall be 100 hours of flying per month: *Provided*, That, to the extent the Civil Aeronautics Board finds, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy or their designated representatives, that the maximum hereinabove prescribed is not required by reasons of the military needs of the armed forces of the United States, the Board may fix, from time to time, by regulation applicable to 1 or more air carriers, the maximum flying hours at less than 100 hours: *Provided further*, That the Board, in accordance with such procedure as it may prescribe, may authorize the maximum flying hours hereinabove provided for to be exceeded to the extent necessary to complete a particular flight for military purposes.

SEC. 2. Every air carrier shall comply with the regulations fixed by the Board hereunder. The powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to the enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Act shall be available to it in the enforcement of this act, and the penalties prescribed in section 902 (a) of that act shall be applicable to violations of this act or any regulation issued thereunder.

SEC. 3. This act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "with", insert "the provisions of this act and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.



Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the removal of the monthly 85-hour limitation for airline-pilot flying and the substitution of 100 hours therefor subject to further discretionary relaxation, as provided by H. R. 6799, will very substantially increase the manpower hours of air-line pilots. The merits of this bill are self-evident.

No one is able to state the exact number of hours of increased service that will result from this change in the law. The estimate that the increased service will equal that of three or four hundred airline pilots, as now in operation, is dependent upon the increased number of such pilots who will be engaged in flying either in the regular air-line service or in the additional war service in which these pilots will engage.

In any event, the change of the law will make a very useful and a very substantial contribution to transport service both by the air lines and in support of our country's war effort.

This is perhaps the first instance during this war in which an organized group of employees has voluntarily come forward and in the interest of national defense supported a change in the law to authorize additional hours of service and that without any hourly increase or overtime pay. This is a commendable action that deserves recognition. It can be said, also, that the air-line carriers and the pilots and copilots have voluntarily heretofore agreed upon terms of employment more favorable to the operating pilots than that required by law.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6483) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. LANHAM, BELL, and HOLMES.

#### CASES UNDER THE EXPEDITING ACT OF FEBRUARY 11, 1903

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6005) to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

The Clerk read the conference report. The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) entitled "An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts con-

stituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

SEC. 3. In any action in a district court wherein the action of three judges is required for the hearing and determination of an application for interlocutory injunction and for the final hearing by reason of the provisions of section 266 of the Judicial Code, the Act of October 22, 1913, chapter 32, or the Act of August 24, 1937, chapter 754, section 3 (being, respectively, sections 380, 47 and 380a of title 28 United States Code), or the Act of February 11, 1903 (32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, section 28 and title 49, section 44), as amended by section 1 of this Act, any one of such three judges may perform all functions, conduct all proceedings, except the trial of such action, and enter all orders required or permitted by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States in effect at the time, provided such single judge shall not appoint, or order a reference to a master, or hear and determine any application for, or vacation of, an interlocutory injunction, or dismiss the action, or enter a summary or final judgment on all or any part of the action: *Provided, however,* That any action of a single judge hereby permitted shall be subject to review at any time prior to final hearing by the court as constituted for final hearing, on application of any party or by order of such court on its own motion."

And on page 2, lines 2 and 3, of the House engrossed bill, after "1903" strike out "(U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 49, sec. 44)" and insert "(32 Stat. 823; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 15, section 28 and title 49, section 44)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,  
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

PAT McCARRAN,  
TOM CONNALLY,  
JOHN A. DANAEER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6005) entitled "An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill adds a new section to H. R. 6005. This new section is retained, in substance, in the amendment agreed to by the conferees. Such new section added by the Senate amendment was substantially the provisions of H. R. 4812 which passed the House on February 2, 1942, which pertained to other three-judge courts, the purpose of which bill was to authorize a single judge to handle preliminary matters. Section 1 of H. R. 6005 relates to the composition of the expediting court. The Senate undertook to include the expediting court authorized by the act of February 11,

1903, as such a three-judge court where a single judge might also be authorized to handle preliminary matters. The language used, however, referred back to section 1 of the bill (relating only to expediting courts under the act of February 11, 1903, as one would have defeated the purpose of H. R. 4812 by limiting to that type of three-judge court the authority for a single judge to dispose of preliminary matters whereas H. R. 4812 was intended to apply to the various other three-judge courts. The amendment agreed to by the conferees would include expediting courts under the act of February 11, 1903 as one of the several three-judge courts where a single judge may handle preliminary matters.

The conferees retained language of the Senate amendment making it clear that a single judge of a three-judge court should not conduct the actual trial. It is believed that H. R. 4812 as it passed the House would not have permitted a single judge to conduct the trial, but in order to make it clear of any doubt, the conferees retained the Senate language providing that a single judge may not actually conduct the trial.

The conferees have agreed to a clarification in the bill of a citation to the United States Code.

The Senate amendment to the title is appropriate to the action agreed upon in conference and the House recedes from its disagreement thereto.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,  
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The bill (H. R. 6005) is a bill to provide that in cases arising under what is known as the Expediting Act, which up to this time have required the action of a court composed of three judges of the circuit court of appeals, the court henceforth may be composed of three judges only one of whom shall be required to be a member of the circuit court of appeals. This will relieve the circuit court of appeals by permitting the use of district judges in three-judge court cases under the Expediting Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous conference report?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It is a unanimous conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It was.

Mr. MICHENER. It is somewhat technical, but it will be a very effective law and will expedite the trial of cases and possibly obviate the necessity of having additional judges.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is entirely correct.

I may say for the purpose of the record, not to consume any extraordinary length of time but to make definite the statement, that this bill, H. R. 6005, is in effect a combination of H. R. 6005 and H. R. 4812, both of which bills passed the House after a unanimous report by the Committee on the Judiciary. They were passed as independent bills in the House. In the Senate they were

combined in one bill. The House conferees took the position that the combination bill was drawn in such a way that it did not accomplish the intended purpose. The members of the Committee of Conference on the part of the House pointed this out in the conference. The Senate accepted our version and the Senate adopted the conference report. The bill comes before us now in what we consider to be proper form as unanimously agreed to by the conferees of both the House and the Senate.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, from my distinguished colleague, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary after a very careful consideration of the measure. If this bill is finally passed and becomes a law, it will relieve the tension very materially as far as judges of the circuit court of appeals are concerned with regard to actions of the character mentioned. It will make possible the use of two district Federal judges to sit with one circuit court judge. This measure is needed, and it will expedite the procedure materially.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman from Indiana, a very valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary has stated the situation correctly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short radio speeches on the sale of Defense bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram which is similar to a number of others protesting against the curtailment of rural mail routes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the capital-gains tax bill made by a former Member of the House, Mr. Pettengill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### CALIFORNIA SALES TAX

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I again want to answer my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] in connection with his bill to prevent the State of California from collecting its 3-percent sales tax. This gentleman says this bill "will not take away from California one right that it has had," but in the same sentence he says, "But it will prevent the State of California from levying taxes on money that is being spent by the Government through contractors, subcontractors, and material men." And right below he states that by the enactment of his bill \$40,000,000 will be taken away from California.

I think we in California know more about the financial structure of that State than does the gentleman from Missouri, and we know that this bill will wreck the State of California. About the only real effect this bill would have would be to place in the pockets of the contractors, subcontractors, and material men far more profits. These will not be passed on to the Government. If the discussion of some of these profits as disclosed by the gentleman from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, is any criterion, you may see how the United States Government is going to come off.

Why should the gentleman from Missouri or the Federal Government at any time tell the State of California what it can or cannot tax? This is an absolute violation of the sovereignty of the State of California and its State's rights, and is an attempt on the part of the Federal Government to tell California what it can do with respect to taxes. So far as I am concerned, the Federal Government will never step its foot over the State line of California to violate that sovereignty, and I hope the Members of this House will kill the Cochran bill if it ever comes before this body.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### SUSPENSION OF THE 40-HOUR WORKWEEK

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable argument over the air and through the press as to where our protests for the suspension of the 40-hour workweek are coming from.

This morning I took occasion to carefully analyze and classify the first delivery of my morning mail. I give you the results:

For suspension: Organizations, 8; wholesale company, 1; insurance company, 1; Housewives, 9; mining company, 1, petitions, 2; threats, 1; farmers, 8; businessmen, 15; laborers, 5; professional men, 2; officeholders, 3.

Against any change: 1 petition, 4 names; 2 wires, labor organizations; 1 letter, labor organization.

This makes a total of 56 in favor of suspending the 40-hour workweek and 4 against any change in labor legislation.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions passed by certain mass meetings held in the Sixth Congressional District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a recent article by Frank Kent in which he defends Mr. Jesse Jones against criticism of being in any way responsible for the rubber situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### CHEHALIS, WASH., IS ON THE ALERT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have many fine patriotic com-



munities in my district and I am particularly proud of the progressive city of Chehalis in Lewis County.

According to a telegram I have just received from my friend and prominent civic leader, Mr. Clarence Ellington, Chehalis, with a population of 5,000, has oversubscribed its campaign to raise \$55,000 for the purchase of a P-40 pursuit plane in 9 days of the 2 weeks. Continuing the campaign the surplus raised is to be used for specialized equipment for the plane. This is a basis of \$9.16 per capita.

A still better record is the total sale of war bonds in Chehalis. To this date bonds amounting to \$360,000 have been sold, which is \$72 per capita.

Chehalis, which is one of the first communities which the Japanese are likely to invade, according to Homer Lea and the military experts, if they attempt an invasion of the Pacific coast, challenges any other community in the United States to excel this record and invites Tokyo to take notice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### SALES TAX IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED RECESS

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand it is being discussed to recess for 2 weeks; so my purpose is to enter a protest against taking an Easter recess.

I have heard it said, "I want to go home and see how my people feel toward certain national problems." Well, for me, I can definitely say I know; that the majority of my people have listened, they have thought, they have drawn their conclusions, they demand less speeches, more action, and with fervent prayers they are asking we gear our industries to operate 24 hours a day and at the same time eliminate all nondefense spending.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MONOPOLISTIC CORPORATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, synthetic rubber, we now learn, could not be developed here because of an agreement between Standard Oil of New Jersey and the German Dye Trust. Already we have been told how expansion of metals has been interfered with for the same kind of reasons. In my judgment, the worst bottleneck we have, so far as increasing American war production is concerned, is the shortage of certain metals, and other necessary products due to opposition on the part of some monopoly corporations which, as Thurman Arnold yesterday said, even went to the extent of agreements between those monopoly corporations and some German corporations. I point out that it is monopoly which strikes hardest at the vitals of any democratic action, and any democratic economic order. For monopoly means restriction of production and only the most ingenious action can break its hold. I am not one to apologize for things that may be wrong in the ranks of labor or any other group, nor do I say that we should not correct them, but I do say that the serious, effective bottleneck is not in labor but is here in these restrictions that have existed and in some respects still exist, and I commend the action of Mr. Arnold and his associates for bringing it so forcibly to the attention of the country. If we are to have full production 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, there cannot be tolerated any attempts on the part of monopolies to preserve their monopoly position at the expense of the fullest expansion of production that our war production requires.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and resolution from the American Legion of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I obtained consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Louis M. Lyon. It has been called to my attention that it exceeds three pages and would cost \$105 more. I ask unanimous consent that the article be included, nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R.

6736, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "without the specific approval of the Secretary of War"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 2.

J. BUELL SNYDER,  
D. D. TERRY,  
JOE STARNES,  
ROSS A. COLLINS,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
D. LANE POWERS,  
ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
FRANCIS CASE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

ELMER THOMAS,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
JOHN H. OVERTON,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
JOSHIAH W. BAILEY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$66,802,500 for rivers and harbors, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$57,502,500, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$9,300,000 applying entirely to the construction of lock and auxiliary works at Sault Ste. Marie on the St. Marys River, Mich., for which a Budget estimate has been presented (H. Doc. 658).

Amendment No. 3: Changes the effective date of the provision with respect to preliminary examinations and surveys conducted, pursuant to law, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Amends the provision with respect to the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles by Federal agencies, other than the Executive Office and the Military and Naval Establishments, so as to make all purchases or exchanges subject to the specific approval of the Secretary of War.

*Amendment in disagreement*

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendment of the Senate:

Amendment No. 2, relating to flood control, general.

J. BUELL SNYDER,  
D. D. TERRY,  
JOE STARNES,  
ROSS A. COLLINS,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
D. LANE POWERS,  
ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
FRANCIS CASE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, there is 1 hour allowed on the conference report, is there not?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to use it.

Mr. POWERS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to use it. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. As I understand it, there is 1 hour of debate, if we so desire, on the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. That is correct.

Mr. POWERS. It is not my intention to take very much time on the report itself. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. There is also 1 hour of debate on Senate amendment No. 2. Is that correct?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. POWERS. Assuming that we do not use the hour on the conference report, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me one-half of his hour on Senate amendment No. 2?

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield the gentleman as much time as we consume on this side. I do not think it is customary to yield time en bloc to the other side on a conference report.

Mr. POWERS. If you have 1 hour, you say you will yield to me as much time as you use?

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield to individuals on your side as much time as we use.

Mr. POWERS. We want a half an hour on this side. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The rule is to divide the time between the proponents and opponents, regardless of their political affiliations.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The rule is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will have control of all the time.

Mr. SNYDER. I will yield as much time to the proponents as I do the opponents.

Mr. POWERS. Then you will yield half an hour to the opponents and a half an hour to the proponents?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not suppose very many are interested in this, but if you

will listen to this statement perhaps we will not require much debate. We had a great deal of debate on the controversial questions when this bill was considered in the House. I do not see any reason why we should have a great deal of debate after this statement.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate placed four amendments on the bill. The statement just read by the Clerk explains the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees on amendments 1, 3, and 4.

The remaining amendment, No. 2, is returned in disagreement. This accords with the arrangement entered into on yesterday when we agreed to the conference asked by the Senate.

I should like to say a word about this amendment No. 2.

It relates solely to the total amount to be appropriated for flood control, general.

The House approved a total of \$128,273,700.

The Senate increased that amount by \$23,789,000.

That increase applies to six projects, and I think the House should know what they are:

First. The Bull Shoals Reservoir project, in Arkansas, \$16,700,000.

Second. The Table Rock Reservoir project, in Missouri, \$2,016,000.

Third. The Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., flood-control project, \$213,000.

Fourth. Clearing and snagging work, Salt and Gila Rivers, Ariz., \$50,000.

Fifth. Mermentau and Vermillion Rivers, La., flood-control project, \$970,000.

Sixth. Readying authorized flood-control projects for building up a reservoir of work available for immediate prosecution to cushion post-war adjustment, \$3,750,000.

The House considered the Bull Shoals and Table Rock Reservoir projects and rejected them.

The House did not have the Oklahoma, Arizona, or Louisiana projects before it. They are all authorized projects, but are not supported by Budget estimates, and, of course, the House provided for projects—three projects, without Budget estimates. The Oklahoma project has a munitions defense plant protection justification. The Arizona and Louisiana projects are urged for giving protection from floods to agricultural areas.

For building up a backlog of worthwhile post-war projects, the House provided \$1,000,000.

I want the membership to have this information before it is called upon to act upon the amendment in disagreement, which is the next step after the conference report shall have been adopted.

The Senate increase involves all of the projects I have named.

At the proper time I shall move to insist upon our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate. I shall do so because of the parliamentary situation. I favor the Bull Shoals project; I think there is much merit in the Oklahoma project, and I should like immensely to vote for the project designed to ease the post-war readjustment. Next to winning the war, I can conceive of nothing of greater importance. It will be a hollow victory, indeed, if we are not ready to make the most of it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman tell us on which of these six items that are included in this proposition, the Senate held hearings?

Mr. SNYDER. All of them.

Mr. TABER. All of them?

Mr. SNYDER. They so stated in their hearings that they had.

Mr. TABER. Does it refer to all of these items?

Mr. SNYDER. It does, sir.

Mr. TABER. As to the Oklahoma item, is it not true that an appropriation was made for this current fiscal year for that item and that the funds therefor have been impounded by the President and the Treasury, and the work has not been allowed to go on?

Mr. SNYDER. My impression is that there was an appropriation of \$300,000 made for that as of the past fiscal year, and that it was impounded, and that this is merely asking for \$213,000 more, making a total of \$513,000 which it was stated in the hearings—at least, it was stated before the conference committee, would do the job.

Mr. TABER. When the President and the Budget thought that the project had so little merit that they have impounded the funds that have already been appropriated for the project?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I am not here to make specific argument for that project, but it is my duty to state that in the conference the gentleman who was advocating this said that a number of Army factories had sprung up along here that needed this protection. That is what they gave to the conference committee. It was a report similar to what we have done at Louisville, Ky. The funds were impounded there last year, but the Army moved in and built a lot of plants right down along the river and, as a protection, we allowed that money so that they could build whatever was necessary at the river to protect those plants. It was stated to us in conference that this was a similar situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice that the amount of money allocated for the construction of the extra lock at Soo, Mich., has been increased by \$1,300,000?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONDERO. No figure has ever been presented to the Rivers and Harbors Committee in excess of \$8,000,000. I wondered what that extra \$1,300,000 was for.

Mr. SNYDER. As we understood there was a situation up there that made it very essential that the work be done and be done right away. It required this amount of money to do it.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it for some item outside of that extra lock at the Soo?

Mr. SNYDER. No; no item outside of general project.

Mr. DONDERO. What I am wondering is where the increase comes in above the \$8,000,000 that was presented to the



Rivers and Harbors Committee as the cost of that extra lock.

Mr. SNYDER. I cannot give the gentleman details, only to say that it must be looked at from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. DONDERO. This is the first time I have seen the figure \$9,300,000 mentioned in connection with the item.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. I understand the extra amount is for auxiliary work in connection with the lock.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. It was my understanding that all work in connection with the lock was not to exceed \$8,000,000. That was the testimony before the House committee; and I am wondering what the additional amount is for.

Mr. TERRY. The estimate is \$9,300,000, including that extra work, as I understand it.

Mr. DONDERO. Some other work outside the lock?

Mr. TERRY. Yes; auxiliary work.

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Mr. DONDERO. I would like to know what that work is.

Mr. SNYDER. I cannot give the details.

Mr. TERRY. It is in connection with this work, as I understand, and was approved by the Director of the Budget when they sent the estimate up here.

Mr. DONDERO. There seems to be some confusion about this additional amount. I do not want in any way to disclose any defense matters, but I would like to know and I believe the House would like to know why the extra \$1,300,000 is necessary.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe the gentleman will find that in the Senate hearings. The gentleman understands this was put in by the Senate.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that to be so.

Mr. SNYDER. As members of the House committee, therefore, we would not know the details of this.

Mr. POWERS. Before the gentleman moves the previous question, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and I also would like to have some time.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall be pleased to yield to these gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as this bill comes back to us from the Senate we find they have added \$33,089,000. It is certainly pretty tough to see the bill treated in this manner, especially when we in the House of Representatives are trying to cut down on nonessential Government expenditures, to have the other body try to force us to spend for items that are not essential to the winning of the war. I refer particularly to the item in disagreement which will be considered after we have disposed of the conference report, \$16,700,000 for Bull Shoals, and \$2,106,000 for Table Rock in Arkansas and Missouri. These two items will cost us eventually \$87,000,000 and not by the wildest stretch of the imagination can

they be considered war functions. In the first place it will take between 3 and 4 years to complete.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Not now.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman should be fair in his statement.

Mr. RICH. If I have made a misstatement, the gentleman from Arkansas may correct it. I am stating the situation as I see it. And I am not making a misstatement.

The House of Representatives is now asked to obligate the Treasury for \$18,000,000 or \$19,000,000, the expectation being to come back later for further appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is about time that either we in the House of Representatives woke up or that the people back home woke up to the things we are trying to do. Personally, I believe the people back home are waking up.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. Is it not true that when these projects were considered in the House they were turned down?

Mr. RICH. That is right; exactly so. They were turned down at one time. We are now faced with this situation again, and it is up to us in the House of Representatives to turn them down again.

Mr. HAINES. Is my colleague certain that these projects are necessary or will contribute to national defense?

Mr. RICH. In 1945 or 1946 they may get some power out there, but in my thinking it seems to me there are so many things of greater importance facing us now that we should not even consider these. We shall have up for consideration before the day is finished another bill calling for the appropriation of \$18,000,000,000. You heard it reported this morning. We have already appropriated for war over \$90,000,000,000, almost all the money we can possibly spend during the whole year 1942, working 24 hours a day making things that are vital to the welfare of this Nation and the winning of this war. That is our first duty, our first obligation. Win the war; that is our first duty and our first obligation.

Mr. HAINES. Is there anything in the hearings that indicates a real need that this money be appropriated at this time?

Mr. RICH. May I say that you and I, as hard as we try to work, cannot do anything. We have worked hard for the last few weeks. I had to go to bed at 8:30 last night in order to be in the office at 9 o'clock this morning. We did not get these hearings until about 15 or 20 minutes ago. How can we look through them? We have to go to appropriation committee at 11 o'clock and pass on an appropriation bill for \$18,000,000,000. It is humanly impossible to do these things. Work as hard as you can from 8 o'clock in the morning till 11 o'clock at night.

Mr. HAINES. I want to commend my colleague for his splendid work. May I say I am in entire accord with the statement he makes.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Because these items are to be spent in the district of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], and because he is working day and night to have this passed, I am forced to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to know what time the gentleman had to go to bed last night to get here today?

Mr. RICH. I had to go to bed at 8:30 last night because I have been working for 4 weeks long, long hours. I am about played out and I cannot take it much longer. I am going to tell you, some of you gentlemen have got to work a little longer or we are going to wreck this Nation. We want more work and less play. More work or less pay.

Mr. TERRY. More work and less talk. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the same old story. The Appropriations Committee of the House and the House tried to do a job in cutting down non-defense expenditures. Then the bill goes to another body and is raised, as usual. In my 10 years' experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee I do not recall having received a bill back in the House from the other body that had not been raised. This is just another glaring example of what is happening on the other side of the Capitol. Where in the world this economy bloc was when the bill passed the Senate is beyond me.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the gentleman aware of the fact there is a report in the Power Division of the War Production Board that the Government's power program by 1944 will result in a 70-percent power surplus over all of the domestic and war needs of the Government as those war needs have been furnished to the War Production Board?

Mr. POWERS. I was not aware of that fact. That is a very interesting contribution the gentleman has made.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that information has also come to me, in addition to the information just stated, that these two particular projects, Bull Shoals and Table Rock, will add a needless part of that surplus power. It is also reported that there is absolutely no war need for these projects in that particular territory of the country today. Further, I think it is important for the Members of the House to know that there has been an attempt to suppress this report until the bill we are now considering can be passed by the Congress. I think that borders on being scandalous.

The Senate has put these two projects back in, and by putting them back in they are reestablishing appropriations in excess of \$87,000,000, the ultimate expense involved in the construction of these two dams; this, after the House has cut them out of the bill.

I am hopeful that the House will repeat its action of a few days ago and strike from the report of the conference committee Senate amendment No. 2 which includes these particular projects that I have just mentioned.

Mr. POWERS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to take some time, through the kindness of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on Senate amendment No. 2. When the House votes on Senate amendment No. 2 it is voting a commitment of \$100,000,000. One hundred million dollars is the commitment that we are going to vote on in a very, very short time. I shall reserve further remarks until I obtain my time on Senate amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 7, line 5, strike out "\$128,273,700" and insert "\$152,062,700."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TERRY moves to recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The amendment is not in order at this time. If an amendment of this kind is to be offered to recede and concur with an amendment, it must be after the House has voted to recede.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede and concur takes precedence at this point.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated very well by the chairman of the subcommittee, when this bill went to the Senate that body put in four items in addition to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock items, which were up for discussion in the House when the bill was before this body.

Much has been said about Table Rock and Bull Shoals not being completed for several years. It was stated in the House that these projects would not be in operation until too late to serve in this war, yet the engineers have told you that Bull Shoals will be in operation in the latter part of 1944 and that the Table Rock hydro will be in operation in the spring of 1945.

Mr. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in a letter which was read in the House, states this:

These projects are essential parts of a program of power supply for the war effort in the region which comprises the States of Arkan-

sas, Louisiana, most of Oklahoma and Texas, part of Missouri, and the westerly portion of Mississippi. This program includes existing generating facilities, new steam-electric units on order by the utilities, new generating capacity on order to serve aluminum and magnesium loads, and existing and other proposed hydroelectric projects.

A summation of the existing assured capacity, after allowance for minimum reserves, in this region, including new steam-electric units on order by utilities for installation this year and the new industrial generating capacity on order for installation in 1942 and future years, is 269,000 kilowatts less than the estimated power requirements in 1943, 222,000 kilowatts less in 1944, 419,000 kilowatts less in 1945 and 483,000 kilowatts less than estimated requirements in 1946. These deficiencies must be made up by a combination of additional steam-electric and hydroelectric generating capacity.

As you know, the limitations on the manufacturers to produce land turbines have become increasingly serious on account of the necessity of pushing, to the fullest extent, the naval and maritime ship program. The same manufacturing capacity is utilized for the production of land and marine turbine equipment. For this reason it is especially desirable to install, in areas where the possibilities for the development of hydroelectric power exists, all of the hydro equipment that can be obtained, subject to the limitations of manufacture. By following this procedure, manufacturing capacity for the production of land turbine equipment can be utilized for areas where the possibilities for the production of hydro power do not exist.

This power is needed by the country at this time in the development of the war program. There is no doubt about it. We know the war will not be over this year, but we do not know whether the war will be over even in 1944 or 1945.

Some of the Members of this House who are now criticizing the development of power which is needed at this time by the Government, when the War Department program came on the floor for the 5,500 airplane program 3 years ago, in June 1939, fought that program at that time, because, they said, "You cannot tell us we are going to have a war." They further said, "The President of the United States is a warmonger and is using the foreign war propaganda to conceal and divert attention from domestic problems."

Yet within 3 months after they were trying to defeat the expansion of the airplane program, we had a war in Europe. From that day on, it has been conclusively demonstrated that more and more airplanes are necessary; that we cannot win battles on land or sea without air superiority.

The President of the United States has asked you for these dams. The President had a supplemental Budget estimate sent down to include the Table Rock and Bull Shoals projects as being necessary for the production of power for the war program. I do not see how gentlemen can get up on this floor and say, "We would vote for these projects if they were necessary for power for war production, but we do not know when the war will be over. These dams may be in operation too late for the war." You do not know when the war will be over, and I do not know it. The President of the United States does not know it. Nobody knows.

I ask you to agree to my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Baldwin	Gifford	O'Day
Barry	Gillette	Osmer
Beam	Gore	O'Toole
Bender	Harris, Va.	Pace
Bennett	Healey	Patrick
Bishop	Hébert	Patton
Boehne	Holmes	Pfeifer
Bolton	Hook	Joseph L.
Brooks	Houston	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	Richards
Buck	Johnson	Robertson
Buckler, Minn.	Lyndon B.	N. Dak.
Buckley, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Burch	Kennedy	Sacks
Burdick	Martin J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Byron	Kennedy	Schulte
Cannon, Fla.	Michael J.	Shannon
Capozzoli	Keogh	Sheridan
Celler	Kilburn	Short
Clark	Kleberg	Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Klein	Stratton
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Summer, Ill.
Day	Kramer	Tolan
Delaney	Lambertson	Vreeland
Dies	Lewis	Wadsworth
Domengeaux	McGranery	Walter
Douglas	McKeough	Weiss
Elliott, Mass.	Maclejewski	Welch
Flannagan	Magnuson	Wilson
Gale	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gavagan	Mitchell	Worley
Gearhart	Mundt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there are items in here involving \$22,000,000. The first one relates to Bull Shoals Reservoir, the second one to Table Rock Reservoir, both of which were thrown out by the House about 10 days ago, when we had the War Department bill up.

These reservoirs are designed, alleged, to promote flood control on the White River in Arkansas, and are power projects in disguise, but they are power projects that cannot be put on an efficient basis. In other words, the engineer testified that the cost of producing power at the plant would be 3.2 mills, as against an average coal cost, which is generally known in regions that are supplied plentifully with coal, of about 2 mills. This means that the power is high-priced power and that if it is going to compete and be transmitted, it is going to be expensive power.

There is a coal plant of considerable size under construction at the present time, which will come out quite a little ahead of this plant, and these two plants cannot possibly be completed before early 1945 or 1946. Both of them are opposed by the Conservation Commission of Missouri. It seems to me it is a waste of money for us to go ahead at this time



with an enormous program of \$22,000,000 when Mr. Churchill tells us that the tide is turning against us in the Atlantic. This was his announcement yesterday. Is it not time for us to wake up and quit monkeying around and get right down to the war effort and quit going into things we cannot possibly have done in time to be of use in our war effort?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Are these dams to be used in a series of dams any of which are now operating?

Mr. TABER. They are new dams and the authorization is \$49,000,000 and the cost of the two dams will be \$90,000,000, or about double the authorization.

Mr. MICHENER. What I am getting at is whether they are to be used in connection with a series of dams, where the same water goes over more than one dam, thereby producing additional power without additional cost.

Mr. TABER. There may be other dams on the river. I cannot tell the gentleman about that. I will leave that to the members on the subcommittee; but these two dams are supposed to a certain extent to go together, although there was no Budget estimate for the Table Rock proposition.

There are four other items in here, including the Tulsa, Okla., item, where there was previously an appropriation of \$300,000, which has been impounded by the President and the Director of the Budget and the Treasury, and is not to be used.

Why should we put any more money into that proposition? There was an item for clearing and snagging the Salt and Gila Rivers, on which there were no hearings, and no one can tell anything about it. There was an item for Louisiana, and the engineers were not called in or asked to give testimony, and that amounted to \$970,000. Then there was an item of \$3,750,000 for planning, and after hearings the subcommittee only allowed \$1,000,000. They did that when they knew what they were talking about. If we have our engineers chasing all over the country trying to get up new projects when there are millions and millions of projects already surveyed, we are going to interfere with the war effort and cloud our efforts to get things done so that we can support the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will reject the motion to recede and concur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was before the Flood Control Committee I appeared before that committee in opposition to both dams. When the flood-control bill was brought in I spoke in opposition to both projects. When this bill was before the House I spoke in opposition to the projects. I merely mention this to show that I have been consistent in my opposition to the Bull Shoals and Table Rock Dams. The House refused to include the projects in the bill before it went to the Senate. Read the Senate hearings and see if

you find any justification in favor of restoring the projects. Read the Senate report and see if you find one word in justification of these projects.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I will not. Answer in your own time; I need mine.

Read the debate in the Senate. You cannot, for you will find there was no debate on this proposition in the Senate; not a word. The bill was passed in the Senate as fast as the clerk could read the amendments, and yet the Senate put two projects in the bill which the engineers of the Army say will cost \$87,500,000. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] says this will cost \$100,000,000. You have a power dam on the White River, the Norfolk Dam, now being constructed, but it will not be completed in 1944 or 1945. It is going to provide power. Yesterday it was shown on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] that the engineers of the Army are not even using the power already available at the Grand River project. Are they going to use the power at Norfolk? Table Rock and Bull Shoals would provide an excess of power, which is not needed. If it were a national defense project, I would support it. I would turn around and go the other way, if we needed it, but it is not a national defense project.

You will hear in a few moments, if he is consistent, from the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS], who will tell you that anyone who opposes this represents the Power Trust. Before he ever saw Washington, I was here fighting the Power Trust. I fought it on Boulder Dam, and on the holding-company bill, and on every public project that was advocated here. Too many to mention. Look at my record. The gentleman from Arkansas has filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with statements, given articles to the press, in which he says anybody that disagrees with him is, according to him, a representative of the Power Trust. If there is one charge from which I can be exonerated, it is that of being a representative of the Power Trust. My action all through my public life has been just the opposite. I am just as much opposed to the Power Trust as is the gentleman from Arkansas, and I have done just as much for rural electrification as he has, and I suggest to him that he might curb his words a little in accusing Members of this House of being representatives of the Power Trust. I am in favor of private utilities when properly conducted, but not when they are operated against the public interest.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield. The gentleman has been allotted time. Here is a chance to save \$87,500,000. True, the authorization is only for \$49,000,000, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] knows that the Chair has ruled time and time again, if a project is in progress, regardless of how much is contained in the authorization, an amendment is in order as an additional appropriation, even though above the authorization. You can appropriate \$200,000,000

on these projects if once you start them. These projects are not necessary. One of them is in my own State, and the other is in the State of Arkansas.

Norfolk does not depend on these projects to generate power. Let us have Norfolk. I am willing to have that power, and then if you need more in that section, come back and convince Congress you do.

There is only one national defense project down there, and it is an aluminum plant. Read the House hearings, and you will see that the aluminum plant is going to have its own power plant. It is not going to take the power from Norfolk, or from Grand River, or from any other public dam down there. It is constructing its own power plant right now.

These projects are unnecessary; it is a waste of public funds at this time. The motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to recede and concur should be defeated. If you want to defeat these projects, if you want to save this money and spend it for vessels, tanks, and planes, and ammunition, vote "no" on the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas. I hope by an overwhelming vote that the House will vote it down.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ].

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make a brief explanation of one item which is included in the amendment. I refer to the item for the Mermentau and Vermilion Rivers project, amounting to \$970,000. This particular item was not presented to the Committee on Appropriations at the time this particular bill was under consideration, because we were not prepared at that time to make a proper presentation. Since 1856 this section of south Louisiana, between the Vermilion and Mermentau Rivers has been suffering from floods, which have progressively grown worse, until 1940, when, due to a tropical storm and precipitation of about 24 inches in 24 hours, the entire section, encompassing about 900,000 acres, was flooded, and resulting in as much as 6 and 7 feet of water in some of the communities. This particular flood, and that experienced in 1941, is due to the silting of the mouths of these two rivers, which makes it impossible for the rain water to flow into the Gulf.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I am sympathetic toward the gentleman's project, but there is no Budget estimate for this.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. No; there is no Budget estimate. It was inserted by the Senate.

Mr. POWERS. And it means that this project is taken out of hundreds of others and placed in this appropriation bill without estimates, and is preferred over the others.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. It is an approved project.

Mr. POWERS. It is an approved project.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. It was only completed just a few weeks ago by the engineering department. But I just wanted to make

an explanation of this item in order to show that there is some connection with this project and national defense.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that there were 2,500,000 bushels of rice lost by the flood of 1940. Forty-two percent of all the rice grown in continental United States is grown in that immediate territory. At the present time the oriental supply is cut off. Cuba, Puerto Rico and South American countries depending on rice as their basic food are unable to obtain it from any other section except Louisiana.

There were 240,000 tons of cane destroyed by the flood of 1940, 750,000 bushels of sweetpotatoes, 800,000 bushels of corn, 1,950 acres of peppers, 2,300 acres of truck, 42,000 bales of cotton, 25,150 head of cattle, 13,300 head of hogs, 4,000 head of sheep, 1,680 horses and mules, and 44,000 poultry.

In addition to this, there are something like 33 oil fields in that immediate territory producing more than 85,000 barrels of oil a day. During the flood it was necessary to close down every one of those oil fields and stop production for several weeks.

Another item which has not been called to the attention of the Congress is that during the 1940 flood the main line of the Southern Pacific from the Gulf coast to the Pacific coast was tied up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] to recede and concur in this amendment.

The facts are there is no power shortage in this particular area of the United States. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] himself stated it would be 1944 before one section of this project could be completed and 1945 before the other could be completed.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. It has been stated by the Federal Power Commission that there is a shortage in this area we are talking about.

Mr. WINTER. Well, I differ with the gentleman's interpretation of what the Federal Power Commission has said about it, and what actually exists.

About a year ago, the Government started to build an aluminum plant at Lake Catherine, Ark. At that time the Defense Plant Corporation and Government organizations in charge asked the power companies to form a power pool to furnish the additional power necessary to operate this aluminum plant. The power companies got together and formed this pool and agreed to furnish power of over 100,000 kilowatts. In the interim the Defense Plant Corporation decided to build its own power plant of 120,000-kilowatt capacity. That plant is now in process of construction. The Government asked these power companies to have 100,000 kilowatts of power ready in March 1942, and that is this

month. The aluminum plant is not ready to go. The power companies have their 100,000 kilowatts of power ready. The interconnections have been made. The power is there. There is 1,500,000 kilowatts of power in this particular area right now. There is an excess of over 200,000 kilowatts, not counting the 120,000 capacity that the Government is building in the aluminum plant itself.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Suppose we put in these two dams and the war ends, where will they have a market for any of it, either that which is there now or that which will be produced in the future?

Mr. WINTER. They will not have any market. With the dam at Norfolk and with the dams owned by private industry on my side of the line over in Kansas, which have now been interconnected and made a part of this pool, there is all the power that they need. They only have one defense plant down there, and that is the aluminum plant.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman will examine page 76 of the hearings he will see that Colonel Reber testified that Bull Shoals would be completed by April 30, 1945, and start delivering power in 1944. Table Rock would be completed June 30, 1946, and would start delivering power in 1945.

Mr. WINTER. If that statement is true, and I assume it is, how on earth can electric power produced in 1945 and 1946 do the defense program any good at this time?

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. For the truth of the gentleman's statement we need only refer to the action taken this morning by Donald Nelson with regard to not furnishing any more copper for the R. E. A.

Mr. WINTER. That is exactly correct. There is no use getting excited about this situation. It may be a fine thing. I do not blame these gentlemen for wanting these dams built in their areas, but as I understand it, the people of Missouri, particularly a great portion of them, except in the part that this particular dam at Table Rock is located, are against this program. I do not know anything about what the situation is in Arkansas, but I do know you are going to expend in the neighborhood of \$100,000,000 under the guise of bringing electric power into an area that is supposed to have a shortage of power, when with these interconnections there now have over 200,000 kilowatts more power than they need.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The people in the southeastern part of Missouri and the northeastern part of Arkansas are tremendously interested in the development of these dams, because that is the only source of power which they have in that great section of the coun-

try that is waiting for development. We do want it and need it badly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]. Most surprising was the statement that they had a million kilowatts of electricity in that area and 200,000 more than was necessary.

Let me say in advance that some day the people are going to send Members to Congress from that section who will help develop the natural resources of the West and the Middle West. The power companies are using the Mississippi River as a Hindenburg line to keep us from going beyond it in the development of the water power resources of this country.

The administration is for both of these projects. It will not take a single dollar away from any other national defense project; besides these projects will pay for themselves. Gentlemen who are living in the tallow-candle age stand up and tell an intelligent Congress that we shall have no market for this power. Do you know what it reminds me of? I heard the same argument made by the predecessors of these gentlemen against the development of Muscle Shoals. They said we had a surplus of power. At that time the country was using 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year we used 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. There is a shortage now. Next year it will take more than 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and the time is not far distant when the American people will use a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Whenever you get to where you use electricity for the purposes for which it was intended you will never have a surplus of power.

How do you know that none of the plants along the Atlantic or Pacific coast are not going to be knocked out? How do you know how long this war will last? How do you know how long we are going to be involved in this great struggle? We are going to need all the power we can develop.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not rather inconsistent on the part of these gentlemen to argue against these projects because the plants will not be completed until 1944, 1945, or 1946, yet you never hear a word from them against the construction of a battleship that will take equally long to complete?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Why, certainly. Of all the men in this House who could gracefully drop out of this fight they are the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and your humble servant now addressing you, because our districts are electrified with power generated on the Tennessee River, and it is being retailed to the people at less than half the rates the people in Missouri,



Kansas, Arkansas, and a large number of other States that are affected have to pay. There is not any reason on earth for thus turning back and resisting modern progress, necessary progress, under the flimsy pretext that this money is needed for something else when it does not take a single dime away from national defense. If it did the President would not be for it.

You may do as you please, but if you defeat these projects you are turning back the wheels of progress. When you vote this motion down you are not only crippling national defense if this war should last for 5 or 10 years, but you are shutting the door of hope in the faces of the people of Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, and of every other section within the distribution radius of one of these dams. The gentleman from Kansas talks about the immediate area. The Army engineers told us in the Muscle Shoals report that the distribution radius was 350 miles, which would reach the city of St. Louis. You are not voting on local propositions, these are national projects.

I hope the motion will be sustained.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, how, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, anyone can say this does not take something away from the prosecution of the war effort is beyond my comprehension. I simply cannot follow such a statement as that just made. The situation is simply this: These dams they are talking of constructing—the Bull Shoals Reservoir on the Arkansas and the Table Rock Reservoir—will take \$19,000,000 to start. But to complete these and the other projects we are now debating will in the end cost \$100,000,000.

What is happening here to the Congress? In the last 4 days we have had before us the Interior Department Appropriation bill carrying \$162,000,000. This is a bill in which every Member of Congress is vitally interested. We have so far spent 4 days on it. Even in that bill there are a lot of items that were not only cut to the bone by the committee before the bill was reported but further cuts were made by the Committee of the Whole.

Here come the same things, a Budget estimate for \$23,000,000, which will cost \$100,000,000. Now, you are going to spend that much by putting these two items in the bill. Does not that seem ridiculous?

Let me give you a statement to reflect on a little bit, and this refers to what was said by the gentleman who preceded me. He said it would not take anything away from our war effort. Let me call attention to the fact that you passed the fourth supplemental appropriation for airplanes, providing \$12,000,000,000 on the 23d of January. On the 26th of January there was reported the Navy Department appropriation bill, and by the time the Senate got through with it there was provided in the bill \$26,500,000,000. You have had the fifth supplemental defense bill for the Army, providing \$32,762,000,000. This afternoon when you finish the Interior Department appro-

priation bill you will have the sixth supplemental national defense bill for \$18,302,187,148. That makes a total for the four bills for war of over \$90,000,000,000, and you have appropriated all that in 62 days.

Now you come in here and want to build dams that are not going to be for the national defense. If there is any, you will not get it until 1945 at the shortest time.

If you agree to the pending motion the people of this country will say that you have wheels in your head. The people of this country will not have any confidence whatever in you. All they can say is that Congress is trying and will wreck our financial stability.

Where are you going to get this money? How are you going to get this money? You have to go back to the people of this country and you are going to bow their backs for 100 years or 500 years in order to pay these debts. The people of America cannot stand it, this Nation cannot stand it, and if you have any love for your country for goodness' sake vote against the motion that has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], and do not agree to the amendments that were placed in this bill by the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol.

The Senate said at the beginning of the year that we ought to take a billion, yes, \$2,000,000,000 away from the spending in civil functions of our Government. It made that statement early in January. Now it comes in here and tries to shove down the throats of the American people and you legislators who are elected by those people, the sum of \$23,000,000 for several projects which will ultimately cost \$100,000,000 and it will not be for national defense. Defeat the motion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I would like to go on a little later. There are about 25 minutes of debate left.

Mr. SNYDER. I only have the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] on this side. Does the gentleman want to be last?

Mr. POWERS. As a member of the committee I think it is my privilege to be last.

Mr. SNYDER. No; not necessarily.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman states he has only one other speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS]?

Mr. SNYDER. That is all.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman wants me to take my 5 minutes now?

Mr. SNYDER. This gentleman here says that he was to have some time.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman had a few minutes on the conference report. He has had no time on Senate amendment No. 2.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman want him to have time?

Mr. POWERS. Yes. If the gentleman has extra time, yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to say there are some people in the State of Missouri who are most sincerely interested in the development of these projects. I say that in spite of the fact that I am very much opposed to them. Their chief interest centers around a future hope of industrial development of that region of the Ozarks, not a war development but a future industrial development which time would not permit to be pertinent in any fashion whatsoever to our war effort. Their support of these projects is admirable. I have no quarrel with these proponents.

These dams were originally proposed, as I understand it, as flood-control measures. Early last fall I brought to the city of Washington and to the War Department a man who is thoroughly acquainted with that entire region. I wanted a careful survey on which to form an opinion. He has made quite a study of the flood-control problems of that entire Ozark region. He spent almost 2 weeks interviewing engineers in the War Department who had anything to do with studying the problem of flood control in this region. After he had completed that survey of the various features and plans of the engineers in the War Department, he returned to me and told me that if it had not been for the insistence of certain individuals in the administration to go ahead with these projects because of their ultimate use as power projects, they could not find any earthly reason to justify them as flood-control projects. As a matter of fact, the opinion prevailed that they were going at the flood-control problem exactly in reverse; that it could better be solved by little dams controlling the upstream water instead of dams on the major rivers, as in the case of the White River.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Not just now. The gentleman had time before and refused to yield to me. If I can spare a minute at the end, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to our attention—and I am repeating this—that the experts on power in the War Production Board have completed a survey which is being withheld for the time being, until the Congress disposes of this bill, which will bring forward the fact that the projects already under way and now in use will by the completion of the year 1944 produce a surplus of 70 percent in all of the power needed to carry on not only the war industries but all the civil use of power which might be expected between now and the close of 1944.

While we see an ultimate expenditure of some ninety million dollars to one hundred million dollars in these two projects, I think it is only reasonable to assume that ultimately, as in many, many other projects, they might well cost two or three times that amount. The history of the past bears that out, and my time does not permit me to give specific examples.

There are power facilities that have been completed in years past in this

area that are not used to their full capacity this very day.

It has been implied that the people of Missouri in opposition to these dams are against progress.

I think I could justly say for the people of the State of Missouri that we are not against progress. Goodness knows it does not take the State of Mississippi to show us, the people of Missouri, progress. We are not against progress. Power development went ahead out in that region, far ahead of some of the power development you have been talking about today. I for one am not opposed to the development of our natural resources for power, even public power, but I am bitterly opposed to the inconsistency here of loading on the backs of the taxpayers every dollar of tax burden they can possibly stand and then wasting that money instead of spending it for direct and immediate war purposes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, so that we shall know exactly what we are doing, I am going to state this proposition bluntly and honestly. We are going to have a vote very shortly on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2. If this motion prevails, it will mean that the taxpayers of this Nation will have another \$100,000,000 thrown down the old proverbial rathole.

Senate amendment No. 2 will obligate the Congress of the United States to spend approximately \$90,000,000 on Bull Shoals and Table Rock. The other four projects in Senate amendment No. 2 probably amount to about \$8,000,000, so there is about \$100,000,000 in all.

I am going to devote these few moments to a discussion of Table Rock and Bull Shoals. If you will recall, on March 11 I spoke against these two projects and the House voted both of them out of the bill. I asked you at that time if you really knew in terms of income tax what \$90,000,000 was, and this is what I said on March 11:

I wonder if every Member of this House knows what \$90,000,000 means? It would take the entire income tax paid by all Members of the House and Senate—at the rate of \$1,000 or more per year per Congressman—for a period of 45 years to pay out \$90,000,000.

I wonder also what the average taxpayer understands by \$90,000,000 in terms of his own income tax? Assuming an average tax of \$50 a year, under the present rate, for taxpayers earning \$2,500 a year it would take the total income tax from 20,000 of these taxpayers over a period of 90 years to equal \$90,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these two projects, providing the rainfall is great enough, will come in as power projects in 1945 and 1946. These two projects will come into production of power in 1945 and 1946 providing priorities are given and they can be built. We know the priority situation today, and those of us who are thinking in terms of priorities feel that priorities will not be granted for these projects and they will not even be completed by 1950.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same old story of the House voting out of a bill certain items and the Senate putting them back in without a word of justification, without a word of debate, merely putting the items back in the bill. If these two projects are national defense projects, Heaven help us. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas is voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I placed in the Appendix of the Record at page A1183 two letters from Jesse Jones and Donald Nelson denying a synthetic rubber plant to the Arkansas area because of power shortage. The gentlemen who say there is no power shortage in that area do not know what they are talking about. We have a desperate and drastic power shortage there. That is the reason the Defense Plant Corporation is having to build a 120,000-kilowatt steam-power plant out there to supply its aluminum plant. There is no power available elsewhere.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said that Table Rock did not have a Budget estimate. It did, of \$6,500,000, and the Senate cut it to \$2,106,000.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] said there were no hearings held in the Senate on these projects. There were. I for one was there and testified before the committee. Here are the hearings. The Army engineers were present and testified.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, because there ought to be a correction made there?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Army engineers testified only on those two projects; they did not testify on the other four.

Mr. ELLIS. I say they did, and I have the hearings here.

Mr. TABER. I have them here, too.

Mr. ELLIS. I have just finished reading the testimony.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] stated that the power companies were ready to supply a great amount of power out there to the Aluminum Co. That is not correct. The gentleman is wrong. The shortage still prevails in that area, even though we have the manganese, the bauxite, the lead, the zinc, and the mercury lying idle and undeveloped there, mostly because we do not have sufficient power.

It is most unfortunate that the parliamentary situation was such that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] had to agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], who objected, that the House conferees would bring this amendment back in disagreement in order to get a conference at all. Actually, a majority of the committee favors this Senate amendment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] has said he is for the Bull Shoals project, and that he asks the House to disagree only because of the parliamentary situation.

The Senate wisely wrote back into this bill \$16,700,000 to start Bull Shoals Dam and \$2,106,000 to start Table Rock Dam. The amount is still \$3,394,000 below the Budget request; \$3,394,000 below the request of President Roosevelt, the War Department, the Army engineers, and the Federal Power Commission.

These two great dams, to cost \$50,000,000 and \$37,000,000, will be self-liquidating and will ultimately cost the people nothing. They will produce 880,000,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power annually in an area where a shortage of power already exists, from the standpoint of war production. They can be almost completed in half the time it will take to construct some of the new battleships we are starting.

Again I would call to your attention the letter which Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, wrote to the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, saying these dams are necessary to alleviate the power situation for national defense in the States of Mississippi, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Missouri—and that since the same capacity is required to produce generators for ships as for steam, either generators for ships or for steam power must suffer, whereas generators for hydro can be obtained. And we have got to almost double the country's power capacity to meet war demands.

Again I would remind you of the Budget statement that these dams are necessary for the war effort.

I need not remind you that the corrupt Power Trust is still blitzkrieking the Congress against these dams.

Some will vote against them because the Power Trust does not want them; some will vote against them because President Roosevelt wants them; some will vote against them to save some money. I hold in my hand a copy of last night's Star, in which you, no doubt, read that yesterday the president of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri was sentenced to 2 years in prison and fined \$10,000 for corrupting the elections and certain public officials of Missouri, and the company itself was fined \$80,000. A vote against the substitute motion is a vote for this and other corrupt power companies of those States.

A vote against these dams because Mr. Roosevelt has asked for them is to shoot politics instead of bullets and bombs at the Japs.

You have already cut more than \$3,000,000 from this item. To cut them out is to shoot economy at the Japs.

A vote against this substitute motion to recede and concur is a vote for Hitler and the Japs and against our boys at the front.

Our chosen leaders in this crisis tell us these dams are necessary. They are best in position to know. Who, then, will vote for our own defeat?

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. It seems to me that every argument that has been made here today is almost identical with the argument that was made against Bonneville and Coulee and the other big dams down



in the T. V. A. Yet, today, it is admitted by all of us that they are a godsend in time of need.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TERRY) there were—ayes 37, noes 97.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 202, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—117

Allen, La.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Green	Pierce
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Pittenger
Beckworth	Hare	Plauché
Boggs	Harrington	Poage
Boland	Harris, Ark.	Priest
Boykin	Hébert	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Ramsay
Brooks	Hill, Wash.	Ramspeck
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Rankin, Miss.
Buck	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	Rogers, Okla.
Cartwright	Jacobsen	Sanders
Casey, Mass.	Jarman	Sauthoff
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Okla.	Scragham
Collins	Kefauver	Shanley
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wash.
Cooper	Kerr	Snyder
Costello	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Lane	South
Cox	Larrabee	Sparkman
Cravens	Lea	Sutphin
Creal	Leavy	Tarver
Culkin	Lesinski	Tenerowicz
Dingell	McCormack	Terry
Disney	McMillan	Thom
Eberharter	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Elliott, Calif.	Manasco	Traynor
Ellis	Marcanonio	Vincent, Ky.
Fitzgerald	Mills, Ark.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fitzpatrick	Mills, La.	Weaver
Flaherty	Murdock	Whelchel
Ford, Miss.	Myers, Pa.	White
Ford, Thomas F.	Nichols	Whitten
Fulmer	Norrell	Whittington
Gathings	Norton	Wickersham
Gehrmann	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gossett	Oliver	Zimmerman
Granger	Pace	
	Patton	

NAYS—202

Allen, Ill.	Carlson	Downs
Andersen, H. Carl	Carter	Duncan
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Durham
Andresen, August H.	Chapman	Dworshak
Andrews	Chenoweth	Eaton
Angell	Chipfield	Edmiston
Arends	Clason	Elston
Arnold	Claypool	Engel
Barden	Clevenger	Englebright
Barnes	Cluett	Faddis
Bates, Mass.	Cochran	Fellows
Baumhart	Coffee, Nebr.	Fenton
Beiter	Cole, N. Y.	Fish
Blackney	Cooley	Fogarty
Bland	Copeland	Folger
Bloom	Crawford	Forand
Bonner	Crosser	Ford, Leland M.
Boren	Crowther	Gamble
Bryson	Cunningham	Gerlach
Bulwinkle	Curtis	Gibson
Burdick	D'Alesandro	Gilchrist
Burgin	Davis, Ohio	Gillie
Butler	Dewey	Graham
Camp	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.
Canfield	Ditter	Guyer
	Dondero	Gwynne
	Doughton	Haines

Hall, Edwin Arthur	MacIora	Sasscer
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Satterfield
Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Scanlon
Hancock	Mason	Schuetz
Harness	May	Scott
Harter	Meyer, Md.	Secrest
Heideringer	Michener	Shafer, Mich.
Hess	Mitchell	Sheppard
Hill, Colo.	Monroney	Sikes
Hinsaw	Moser	Simpson
Hobbs	Murray	Smith, Maine
Hoffman	Nelson	Smith, Ohio
Holbrook	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith Va.
Hope	O'Connor	Smith, W. Va.
Hunter	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Imhoff	O'Leary	Spence
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Neal	Springer
Jennings	O'Toole	Stearns, N. H.
Jensen	Paddock	Stefan
Johns	Pearson	Stevenson
Johnson, Calif.	Pfeiffer	Sullivan
Johnson, Ill.	William T.	Sweeney
Johnson, Ind.	Ploeser	Taber
Johnson, W. Va.	Plumley	Talbot
Jones	Powers	Talle
Jonkman	Randolph	Thill
Kean	Rankin, Mont.	Tibbott
Kee	Reece, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Keefe	Reed, Ill.	Vorys, Ohio
Kilday	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Kinzer	Rees, Kans.	Ward
Knutson	Rich	Wasielewski
Kunkel	Rizley	West
Landis	Robertson	Wigglesworth
Lanham	N. Dak.	Williams
LeCompte	Robertson, Va.	Winter
McGehee	Robison, Ky.	Wolcott
McGregor	Rockefeller	Woodruff, Mich.
McIntyre	Rockwell	Woodrum, Va.
McLaughlin	Rodgers, Pa.	Young
Meas	Rogers, Mass.	Youngdahl
	Rolph	
	Russell	

NOT VOTING—112

Baldwin	Hart	O'Day
Barry	Hartley	Osmer
Beam	Healey	Patman
Bell	Heffernan	Patrick
Bender	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett	Hook	Pfeifer
Bishop	Houston	Joseph L.
Boehne	Howell	Richards
Bolton	Jarrett	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Jenks, N. H.	Romjue
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Sabath
Buckley, Minn.	Luther A.	Sacks
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson	Schaefer, Ill.
Burch	Lyndon B.	Schulte
Byrne	Kelly, Ill.	Shannon
Byron	Kennedy	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Martin J.	Short
Celler	Kennedy	Smith Pa.
Clark	Michael J.	Starnes, Ala.
Cole, Md.	Keogh	Steagall
Cullen	Kilburn	Stratton
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Kieberg	Summers, Tex.
Delaney	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	Kocalkowski	Thomason
Dies	Kramer	Tinkham
Domengeaux	Lambertson	Tolan
Douglas	Lewis	Treadway
Drewry	Ludlow	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott, Mass.	Lynch	Vreeland
Flannagan	McGranery	Walter
Gale	McKeough	Welss
Gavagan	McLean	Welch
Gearhart	Maclejewski	Wene
Gifford	Magnuson	Wheat
Gillette	Mansfield	Wilson
Gore	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harris, Va.	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
	Mundt	Worley

So the motion was rejected.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Thompson against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Bennett.  
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Day.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Short.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Osmer.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Richards with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Mott.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Houston with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Capozzoli.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Hook.

Mr. Bean with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy.

Mr. Kramer with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Schulte with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts.

Mr. Klein with Mr. McKeough.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Worley with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Merritt.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Wene.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. Sacks with Mr. Magnuson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6845, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read down to the national parks, page 104, line 11.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I propose to offer amendments reducing the amounts of the maintenance charge for each individual park 10 percent. I would much prefer to offer one amendment covering the whole picture than to offer individual amendments. I am wondering if, when we get to the first item, it would be agreeable to the committee that unanimous consent be granted for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I think that that will be perfectly agreeable. However, I wish it to be plain that the committee does not agree to any such proposed deduction.

Mr. TABER. I am asking only as to procedure; I am not asking the gentleman to commit himself as to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that procedure will expedite the consideration of the bill, and that will be perfectly agreeable. I remind the gentleman, however, that the Park Service has been cut more than 60 percent now. It has been cut more than any one of the 26 agencies. Our Republican friends on the committee played a major role in writing the bill, as far as the Parks Service is concerned, and if our friends across the aisle wish to turn on their own handiwork it is welcome to do so.

Mr. TABER. I think it will appear perfectly fair that the cut to the maintenance and administration of the individual parks will be of benefit not only to the Park Service but to the public.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

How much does the 10-percent cut the gentleman is suggesting amount to in the aggregate?

Mr. TABER. About \$300,000.

Mr. LEAVY. And that applies to a single activity in the Park Service?

Mr. TABER. It applies only to the items with reference to the maintenance of individual parks.

Mr. LEAVY. I think it is highly desirable in the interest of saving time and would accomplish whatever we would if we considered them separately. I am not in accord with the gentleman's views about making the cut.

Mr. TABER. That is a matter for discussion. What I am talking about is the matter of procedure.

Mr. LEAVY. I think it is desirable.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If we should take up the individual items, we would have quite a good deal of amendments, and it would take a long time, and if we are permitted to make this one item, I think it will be the sense of the House that we could cut down 10 percent on the Park Service without injury to the Service whatever. It would be a good thing for the taxpayers and for the Service. I hope the amendment to be offered by the gentleman will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, we have agreed to the procedure, but if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others keep discussing the matter, we might be tempted to withdraw our agreement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the House and the country is very much concerned with a bill pending before the Naval Affairs Committee, which deals with very important subject matters, namely, the limitation of profits, the question of the 40-hour-week suspension, and the question of the closed shop. For the last 10 days the Naval Affairs Committee has been conducting hearings from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon. A great many witnesses have already testified and there are requests from a great many other witnesses to be heard. For instance, just a few moments ago I had a communication from a shipbuilder on the Pacific coast, who is anxious to appear before the committee. The committee is doing everything humanly possible to expedite the matter, but at the same time the importance of the legislation requires a most careful study and investigation. I find that it will probably not be possible for the committee to present a bill to the House dealing with this subject matter or dealing with any phase of it between now and the 13th day of April. By that time I am hoping that on that date the Naval Affairs Committee may be in a position to lay before the House a bill dealing with these matters that I have briefly spoken about. I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, so that Members of the House and the country may be advised with reference to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acadia National Park, Maine: For administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including \$3,000 for George B. Dorr as superintendent without regard to the requirements of the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 22, 1920 (5 U. S. C. 691-693, 697-731), as amended, \$3,000 for temporary clerical services for investigation of titles and preparation of abstracts thereof of lands donated to the United States for inclusion in the Acadia National Park, and not exceeding \$1,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$51,215.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at this time to offer an amendment relating to the items beginning on page 105, line 19, and extending through and including the item on page 112, line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. TABER. The purpose is to offer an amendment which will reduce each of these items 10 percent; offer it as one amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is just a horizontal reduction?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:  
Page 105, line 6, strike out "\$51,215" and insert "\$45,715."  
Page 106, line 16, strike out "\$20,385" and insert "\$18,380."  
Page 106, line 18, strike out "\$105,260" and insert "\$94,760."  
Page 106, line 24, strike out "\$88,870" and insert "\$80,000."  
Page 107, line 9, strike out "\$193,480" and insert "\$179,000."  
Page 107, line 15, strike out "\$128,535" and insert "\$115,700."  
Page 107, line 25, strike out "\$31,420" and insert "\$28,200."  
Page 108, line 6, strike out "\$114,130" and insert "\$102,700."  
Page 108, line 12, strike out "\$64,070" and insert "\$57,600."  
Page 108, line 18, strike out "\$75,150" and insert "\$67,900."  
Page 108, line 20, strike out "\$28,520" and insert "\$25,850."  
Page 108, line 25, strike out "\$87,555" and insert "\$33,750."  
Page 109, line 8, strike out "\$57,990" and insert "\$49,200."  
Page 109, line 13, strike out "\$80,900" and insert "\$72,900."  
Page 109, line 19, strike out "\$64,570" and insert "\$58,160."  
Page 109, line 25, strike out "\$27,610" and insert "\$24,900."  
Page 110, line 6, strike out "\$146,275" and insert "\$131,850."  
Page 110, line 12, strike out "\$62,290" and insert "\$56,090."  
Page 110, line 18, strike out "\$20,225" and insert "\$18,220."  
Page 110, line 24, strike out "\$105,665" and insert "\$95,165."  
Page 111, line 8, strike out "\$133,780" and insert "\$120,480."  
Page 111, line 14, strike out "\$101,405" and insert "\$91,105."  
Page 111, line 20, strike out "\$23,600" and insert "\$21,300."  
Page 112, line 5, strike out "\$449,530" and insert "\$404,600."  
Page 112, line 17, strike out "\$317,690" and insert "\$286,000."  
Page 112, line 23, strike out "\$44,090" and insert "\$39,600."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of cutting down the amounts required for administration, maintenance, and improvement of the national parks. With the exception of the Acadia Park, which I think is the first one, the cuts by the committee have been very small. The cuts over last year's bill have ranged from 2 to as high as 13 or 14 percent. The average would be about 3 or 4 percent, the way I remember it. I have not touched any of the monuments; I have simply covered the parks. The situation is just this: Last year 8,000,000



people visited the parks. This year down to the time the automobile restrictions went on the park attendance was about the same as last year to a comparable date—perhaps a little increase. It is perfectly apparent to all of us when we come to consider that people are not going to have automobiles to run around with that the attendance at these parks will be divided by 4; it probably will be way below that. We probably would be justified if we came here and asked for a 25-percent cut in the maintenance and operation of these parks. I am saying this not as one who is particularly critical of these parks, because I believe they are great institutions, but because of the reduced requirements resulting from much smaller attendance it will not be necessary to have so much help around looking after the visitors. I feel that this is a very modest request and one clearly in accord with sound administrative policy. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and save approximately \$300,000. I think this is as much as one need say on the subject. Frankly, I do not see how anyone who takes a position in favor of sound administration can criticize my stand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there is much in what the gentleman said about the reduction of travel, but I am wondering if this amendment should carry—whether further legislation would be necessary to permit the park employees to be reassigned to other duties? I have in mind the fact that the Classification Act fixes the type of work certain employees may do, and it seems to me that to apply a reduction of this sort to the National Park Service may require some further action by Congress to overcome limitations.

Mr. TABER. There will be fewer employees, resulting from the draft and because some of them will seek other employment. We have here, for instance, the Hawaiian park, which I put in the same category with the others. This is a fine park, but practically all of it has been taken over by the Army.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No doubt they will lose many employees, but the question is whether the reduced personnel can be reassigned to certain duties without some change of the Classification Act.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; I do not believe there is any question about that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this in any way affect the ability of the Government to keep up the parks or to administer them?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, about half the park employees have been required to look after visitors and to take care of them during the peak of the season. The volume of tourist travel is going to drop off and this in itself will release quite a number of employees to carry on maintenance and administration. I do not believe it will interfere with the protection and upkeep of the parks at all.

Mr. DONDERO. And the upkeep of the parks will be that much less.

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The following gentlemen have asked for recognition on this amendment: Messrs. ANDERSON of New Mexico, MCINTYRE, JONES, LEAVY, SCRUGHAM, and RICH. Each gentleman will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that attendance at the national parks has been increasing, that up to the 1st of March of the present year the increase over a similar period of last year has been 4.29 percent, and more than 9 months of this has been since the tire-rationing order went into effect. Let me point out further and emphasize the fact that the park system is being extensively used to give to the service men facilities for recreation and rest. Three hundred and thirty-eight service men visited the parks in the last 8 months and this number will probably increase. Almost all of the parks are located near some military camp.

The next important thing about this proposed cut is that the maintenance force in the parks has already been cut to the bone. If you will read the list commencing on page 39 of the report, you will find that with few exceptions each and every park has received a more or less drastic cut, depending somewhat on the location. The Park Service altogether has been reduced from some \$14,000,000 last year to some \$5,000,000 as a total for the next fiscal year.

The additional cut as proposed will seriously injure our national park system for the reason that the crews they have now for maintenance and supervision are necessary, primarily for fire protection and for protection against vandalism. Any cut such as proposed by the gentleman from New York will, in my opinion, seriously injure the efficiency of the park service system. In justice to this splendid and efficient organization, I ask the Members to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and desire to point out to the Members of the House that the Carlsbad Caverns, included in this appropriation, took in last year \$352,000 as against an appropriation of \$110,000, a net profit to the Government for its park system of \$242,000, in connection with a park which was given to the Government by the State of New Mexico after that State had acquired it

through appropriations. If you cut this appropriation still further, you merely increase the profit to the United States Government.

I call your attention also to the fact that this park is located in a portion of the United States where there are a tremendous number of military camps. A great many soldiers are quartered in Texas and in New Mexico. Those boys have been making use of the park facilities this year as they have never been used before.

This appropriation has already been reduced at a time when more people are coming to the park. I submit it is not fair to the State and to the people who gave this park to the United States Government, if you try to make more of a money maker out of it when it is already producing a quarter of a million dollars of net revenue every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, these items may well be cut by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], because these Budget estimates were made before the Pearl Harbor debacle was fully realized. Since that time we have learned of the restrictions—one, the curtailment of the production of automobiles; two, the freezing of tires, due to the fall of the Dutch East Indies. This is very acute.

All of this means that fewer people will go to the parks. Look at the personnel provided for each one of these individual parks. There are 45 on the pay roll in the Carlsbad Caverns Park. Cut 10 percent off the manpower in that park, and will it close up? You will still have enough people there to run the park and to entertain the soldiers. Go down through every one of them.

Here is the park at Crater Lake, Oreg., in which there are 22 positions, involving an expenditure of \$48,247. Will 10 percent close that park?

Let us take Glacier National Park, 61 positions, total of \$126,000. Will a cut of 10 percent close that park? Can they not still entertain, with the restricted travel and the restricted rubber supply, the number of people who will come to these parks?

I submit also that in the over-all administration of the parks there has not been enough of a cut in Washington in comparison with the cuts that have been made throughout the bill. These items could stand a cut in addition to what the gentleman's amendment provides.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, these 10-percent cuts will release a number of men for productive work to help deliver enough goods soon enough to the boys who bare their breasts for their country. It is later than you think.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, certainly we can make cuts in the National Park Service without interfering at all with the handling of the affairs of the national parks. They will go on just the same and without any difficulty or impairment in service to the public.

You have heard gentlemen on this side of the aisle speak about the cut we have made in the appropriations for the national parks. Let me show you what we cut. Out of the total appropriation we cut off \$9,287,410 from last year. Here is what we cut out of it: Roads and trails, \$2,820,150; Blue Ridge Parkway, \$5,735,765; physical improvements, \$293,740; Travel Bureau, \$65,180; and monuments, \$23,800; and I have not given them all to you. This makes a total of \$8,914,000. Deduct that from the total cut of \$9,287,410, and you will see that we have only cut all the other items in the bill, and I did not include all the cuts, \$273,375.

We have not cut this bill nearly enough. We ought to cut these items 20 percent instead of 10 percent, as provided by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House what harm there would be in closing these parks altogether for the duration?

Mr. RICH. I am not in favor of closing the parks. I think we ought to keep them up, but look at the money we have appropriated here. As I just said, instead of cutting them down 10 percent, we ought to cut them 20 percent. We are hoping that we will get enough Members here to put a little efficiency into the operation of these parks. We just want to cut out the waste and extravagance; that is all we are trying to do now. We ought to do more.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would not the people have a little more money to buy defense bonds?

Mr. RICH. Certainly they would.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I suppose the gentleman heard the testimony that was given before the committee. Was any evidence given to indicate that the number of those who visited the parks would have anything to do with the maintenance of the parks?

Mr. RICH. Yes; you get revenues from the parks but your expenses are greater than your revenues. I want to economize in the operation and by economy we can keep from raising that much more revenue. It is an efficiency amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yellowstone National Park is the oldest national park in the United States. It takes in almost as much as is paid out. It has an acreage of approximately two and a quarter million acres, covered by the finest growth of timber, pines, and so forth, you have ever seen. If any cut is made in the item for

operation and maintenance and looking after that park, that is what may happen. During the hot, dry months of July, August, September, and October fires may break out—and this may be a good year for them to be started in some underhanded way—and they may destroy this entire area.

Mr. LEAVY. I may say to the gentleman generally that I am very much opposed to this cut, and I propose, if I can in the limited time I have, to show how disastrous it would be not alone to the park to which the gentleman refers but to all the 26 national parks.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I say has application also to Glacier National Park. It would be a horrible mistake to cut down the operating expenses of those parks, particularly this year.

Mr. LEAVY. It applies to all the parks.

May I state that in the first instance I was favorable to this type of amendment, because it is a great time saver, but like all blanket amendments, you can never know that you are doing the right thing or that you are not doing the wrong thing by either supporting or opposing it.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman tell us some particular instance where he is sure we would be doing the wrong thing?

Mr. LEAVY. I propose to do that.

This budget was made up by the Park Service prior to Pearl Harbor. After Pearl Harbor, they made further reductions. If you will turn to page 607 of the hearings, you will find that they state they have curtailed every regular maintenance and operation activity to a minimum, and that this reduction will require postponement of all road work, parkway work, and all trail construction work. They further say:

In recognition of our responsibility in the war effort, the National Park Service plans to save \$302,295 in its current appropriations by curtailment of expenditures.

Then they discuss the 26 parks. I am not going to refer to all of them because my time is limited, but you will find that without exception, including the elimination of roads and parkways, every park was cut from 5 to 20 percent.

Then you find that if we were to make another 10-percent cut, such cut could readily be the difference between the total destruction of a park or the saving of it.

I am surprised that any Member of Congress would even think of suggesting that we close the parks. The parks represent assets running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Last year 21,050,000 American citizens went into these parks and came out of them better men and women and better Americans. This year there may be some reduction in the number of persons who go into the parks, but there will still be a large number of visitors to the parks.

Many of the Army camps are now being placed in the West so that they can make use of the parks.

The fire hazard in the parks just as in the forests this year will be greater than it has ever been. Can we think for a moment of taking \$340,000 or \$350,000 out of this bill and thereby probably

destroying in whole or in part one of the greatest assets we have, the national parks, an asset recognized by every nature lover and, I think, even by those who do not love nature? America without its magnificent national parks, would have lost one of its greatest charms.

The gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER] has been active in the 6 years I have been here in Congress in the matter of reducing appropriations and saving money. In this particular amendment he would not effect an economy, but might destroy these parks. He left out all the monuments. If he had proposed to cut 10 percent off the appropriations for all the monuments then, of course, he would have gone into practically every congressional district in the country and his amendment would have had no chance at all.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that we are going to offer an amendment as to the monuments.

Mr. LEAVY. Many of these parks are actually money makers. Mammoth Cave National Park produces considerably more in revenue than the whole item for that park. The same is true with Carlsbad, Yellowstone, and a number of others. It would be a calamity to have this amendment prevail, because none of you believe that we ought to destroy a great national asset.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 48, noes 51.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 62, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

National monuments: For administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and preservation of national monuments, including not exceeding \$3,000 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the custodians and employees in connection with general monument work, \$334,625.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 113, line 5, strike out "\$334,625" and insert "\$301,263."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is to cut 10 percent off of the funds for the operation of the national monuments. We just had an amendment a few moments ago to knock off 10 percent from the national parks. All the Republicans, I think, voted for that economy, four or five Democrats voted with us, but we went down to defeat. It was not an ignominious defeat, it was a glorious defeat, because it showed that practically all of the Republicans are for economizing in the operation of the Government. I would like to know how the Democrats are all going back home and show their peo-



ple how they tried to economize. If each one of you Democrats is going to say that he was one of the three or four who voted for that economy, you are going to get all mixed up and you are going to have a terrible time to explain. I charge this administration as being the most extravagant in the history of our country.

Mr. Chairman, they do not like it on the Democratic side and the country will not like it, either. You will find today that the country is not going to like the fact that all of you voted to keep in the amount recommended for the operation of these parks. The people of this country are going to be compelled to work and work and work, and they are not going to have an opportunity to go to these parks. When you keep all the men at work in these parks you are going to have to account to your constituents for the amount of your expenditures on them.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. While the gentleman is lecturing, let him call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that all of this money to operate these pleasure parks must be borrowed and the Government must issue bonds and go into debt for every dollar appropriated. These parks are fine and should be developed when we can afford it. This expenditure is not essential at this time. It may be desirable in peacetime, but the committee well knows that these parks will have very few visitors next year. The operating personnel will be needed in the grim business of war. It seems unthinkable that the committee is insisting on the country borrowing money and selling bonds to pay the employees in these parks who will not be needed next year.

Mr. RICH. If this were for the operation of the Government or for an essential activity, that would be one thing, but every one of these parks has had a great deal of deadwood around, men who did not really have anything to do or enough to do to keep them busy. Yet we are maintaining this year almost the same schedule that we had last year and the year before. It is just too much; it costs too much; and I know a lot of you on that side of the aisle are looking at me with an expression of rage, but that does not make any difference. I do not care what you may say about this matter; it is time for you to stop spending money and it is time for you to economize. Now I am giving you a chance. You can say all you want about me. If the people of my district do not want me to economize, then I do not want them to send me back here, because I am going to continue to fight for economy in Government operation, and I ask you again, where are you going to get the money? Only by severe taxes on your people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given us another lecture on economy and, as usual, his is a masterful oration. But once again he speaks in glittering generalities. I am sure that all Members enjoy hearing him. If I wanted to be a trifle facetious, however,

I might be tempted to say that we could save some money by having less talking done on this floor and a little more action in and by the committee. I am sure the gentleman knows what I mean. The record shows I demanded and consistently supported every possible economy in the committee. If the gentleman makes any more economy speeches, I might be tempted to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the only increase in the pending bill above Budget estimates is the \$2,800,000 in three reclamation items. These rather marked increases were placed in the bill because the gentleman joined in raising the bill that amount above the Budget estimate.

Mr. RICH. Name the item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Surely the gentleman remembers. Surely his memory has not suddenly failed him. Does the gentleman deny that he helped "up" this bill to the tune of \$2,800,000?

Mr. RICH. I ask the gentleman to name the item that I helped to increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, well, if the gentleman insists on forcing me to show that he talks economy here and votes for items to the tune of \$2,800,000 without a sign of a Budget estimate, I can sure call his hand.

Mr. RICH. Just name one. The gentleman cannot do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, since the gentleman asks for it, here goes. If the gentleman will forget his economy lecture for a moment and turn to the hearings he will recall, I am sure, some very splendid reclamation projects in the West. One of such projects is the All-American Canal. I am not criticizing the gentleman for joining in the move to raise that one item a cool million dollars. I am simply calling the gentleman's hand, or should I say "bluff"?

On the other hand, in my own State, where there is only one reclamation project—the Altus-Lugart project—I did not demand extra funds for that worthy project. It had about \$600,000 last year. This year the Budget reduced the item to \$100,000. Certain members of the committee hinted that they might give my State a little mite above the Budget estimate. Well, no additional funds for Oklahoma are in this bill. I did not assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. I did not say, "Give me mine, war or no war." My skirts are clean. Is that not correct? Does the gentleman deny that? Have I called the gentleman's hand? Just who is really for economy, anyway? Does the gentleman wish for me to give him further details? I wait for the gentleman to enter his denial or make his confession.

Now, as to the appropriation for national monuments, the Bureau of the Budget cut this item \$23,800 below what they had last year, a sizable reduction.

And then the committee cut it \$10,755 below the Budget estimate. Again I remind gentlemen that the Park Service was reduced more than any other of the 26 agencies in the entire bill. This deep cut was made on an implied promise, at least, of some real cooperation from the other side of the aisle. If the kind of sniping we have had at the bill is the gentleman's idea of cooperation,

then we have no complaint, except to insist the gentleman save his lectures on cruel economy for some future time and to someone else. I might add that neither the gentleman nor his party has a corner on honesty, intelligence, or patriotism.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I was very much amused to hear the gentleman on the other side pretending that we ought to turn this Department of the Interior over to the Republicans. The last time we did that we lost Teapot Dome, and it took us years to recover it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. I rise to correct one statement that has been made, and that is that all of this money for Park Service operation has got to be borrowed. That is not correct. The fact is that about 50 percent of these appropriations are earned by the several parks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; the Park Service alone turned in last year several times the amount of money involved here. In fact, the exact figures are \$2,179,119.

Mr. NORRELL. And in conclusion Hot Springs National Park comes nearer being self-sustaining than any other park in the country. This year it is greater than any other time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And may I call attention to the fact that the Yellowstone Park brings in almost as much money every year as it takes to run the park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true. There are two of the parks that turn in considerably more each year than the entire amount to operate them. I refer to Carlsbad and Mammoth Cave.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not true that Carlsbad turns in \$300,000, and that it costs only \$100,000 to operate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct; a mighty fine record.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was really surprised to hear my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] inject politics into this debate. I know that it is awfully hard, as long as this aisle runs through the middle of the Chamber, to keep political discussion off the floor, but I also know that it is the consensus of opinion in this House that at this time politics should be kept to a glimmer, a very dim glimmer. Then for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to get up and state in the Record that nobody but Republicans wanted to vote for economy is cheap politics—very cheap politics. Such politics should not be practiced at this time on the floor of this House. I would not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to me in my patriotism and love for this country, and I would not ask the Republicans to yield to the Democrats in that respect, in these days, but I do not think that either the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the Republicans of the House should ask that of the Democrats. This is a far bigger issue than the success of a party and the success of the elections next fall. It is all

right to make your individual record and let the collective individual records speak for themselves. A few days ago on a division vote, when I was a bit angry, I took the floor and said that there were only a certain number of Republicans that voted for a particular amendment.

The majority leader took me to task for that, and he was right. I should not have done it. Neither should we here on either side take unto ourselves all of the credit for economy or anything else.

I could say something about the type of amendments that have been introduced to this bill and to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill that was considered a few days ago, where blanket, ill-advised cuts, straight down the line, were offered. But I do not think it is necessary to charge anybody with bad faith for that. I did not vote to cut out this appropriation for the national parks, and I do not have one in my district. I am just not going to support amendments, the basis of which is to cut 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent—some arbitrary percentage picked out of the air, just so that I can go to my people and holler, "I am a great economist." I hope I am an economist, but I hope I will temper my desire for economy with good judgment. That is what I want to do. There is such a thing as false economy. As far as I as a Democrat am concerned, I am not ashamed of the fact that a majority of the men on the right side of this aisle voted this afternoon against an amendment which would take an arbitrary cut of an arbitrary percentage straight down the line out of any appropriation. If it were necessary, I would be perfectly happy to go to the hustings of this country with the record of the Democrats against the record of the Republicans for economy or good government at any time; but I do not think we ought to be fighting that now on the floor of this House when we have a war to win.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of this debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] will be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like 2 minutes to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

WE NEED SOME COMMON-SENSE APPROACH TO LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting to note the efforts of our colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT JONES, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable ROBERT F. RICH, and others, in their effort to re-

duce the nonmilitary expenditures in this Interior Department bill. The majority may talk economy, but they do not seem to relish it when it is offered, and they therefore must accept the responsibility of continuing unnecessary expenditures. What they do not try to cloak under the pretext of military needs they make a feeble effort to justify on the grounds of necessity. Where are the exponents of economy who made themselves so effectively vocal when the agricultural appropriation bill was up last week?

The people in general are desirous of obtaining a reduction in or a termination of nonmilitary expenditures. The people want to win this war. They are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to do so. They can see no more excuse for "certain Government agencies as usual" than they see a reason for "business as usual." The public thinks that certain Government employees should be compelled to accept other employment, if they are engaged in nonmilitary work, just as employees in private industry are compelled by the thousands to go out and find other jobs.

Millions upon millions of dollars could be saved in these bills, and still we could help the war effort instead of retard it. Why all these expenditures for operating the national parks, when people are not going to get any tires to go to the parks?

Take the appropriation for surveying new irrigation projects, as an example. There may be some excuse to complete the irrigation projects already started, but why, in the name of common sense, should we be appropriating money at this time for someone to run around and investigate an opportunity to find new lands to put under irrigation? Why should we appropriate thousands upon thousands of dollars of our grandchildren's earnings to try and find new lands to irrigate when we have millions of acres of land now under cultivation that will not be efficiently worked this year because of lack of labor to crop the land already available for production? This does not make sense.

It appears that many Members, sitting here year after year, have become so accustomed to tossing the millions and billions of somebody else's money around that they cannot cease to do so. They continue to toss the taxpayers' money out the window, even when we are faced with the greatest war in history. It is not any wonder that people are getting sick and tired of the kind of legislation we pass. It is not any wonder that the press criticizes the kind of legislation that we do pass.

Let us quit this waste and extravagance and unwarranted procedure and, at least, once and for all, get down to some common-sense legislation. I repeat, the people have the will to win this war. They do not want to waste time, money, and labor on a lot of programs that were questionable in peacetime and indefensible in wartime.

If you spenders keep on "rolling out the barrel," you will find that someone else will be having a "barrel of fun" instead of the wasters of the public funds.

The people are tired of hearing about politics. They do not like to be reminded that the New Deal is more dynamic than fascism and more revolutionary than communism. They do not want to hear about the New Deal or the old deal. They want to win this war and they know that the first step to win it is to curtail all unnecessary expenditures and put all crackpot legislation in cold storage and leave it there. We must realize that an enlightened and aroused public opinion is essential to the best war effort, and necessary for the welfare of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I listened with considerable interest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]. I do not think it makes any difference about the political side of these problems as far as Democrats and Republicans are concerned, but I do think it might be a good idea if those on the majority side of the aisle they just would not try quite so hard to defend the bill because the committee adopted in this form, but be a little more realistic about this thing. I say that to the Republican side of the aisle also. Nobody, of course, wants to injure this program. I suppose it will be like water on a duck's back to insist on a small reduction of 10 percent on this big item here for more than \$300,000.

I do not think, according to the hearings as I have read them, that the \$10,000 cut that was mentioned was particularly scientific, as far as that goes, but here is one part of the program that does not connect very closely with our war program. If we use a little independent judgment and save 10 cents out of every dollar on this item of more than \$300,000, we would save \$30,000. That is a lot of money out in my part of the United States. Of course, we will have some travel. People who have money will travel around some, but we must bend our energies now to win this war. We have 2,000,000 men in the service and we are going to put 2,000,000 more in before long. Our consideration will be given to something else than traveling and vacationing this summer, that is most of us. We can maintain these monuments and keep them in shape at least for this year and you can trim these salaries and cut out some of the help, because you will not need so much of it. Many of these men will be in the service. If not in the service, they will be needed somewhere else far more necessary right now than in this kind of employment.

All you have to do is to take 10 percent of the whole thing. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] suggested that this straight cut did not mean anything. It will mean a saving of \$30,000 to the taxpayers of this country. That is what it will mean. The chairman of the subcommittee is not going to take the floor and tell you there has been any so-called scientific cutting in this measure. The reduction of \$10,000 made by the committee does not appear to be scientific. If so, the hearings do not disclose it.

Let us be realistic now and appreciate the fact that we need this money for our war program and for guns and tanks and



airplanes far more than for activities of this kind right now. We are not asking you to eliminate even a major part of the expenditure; just 10 percent. It may have been all right to approve this item in full a few months ago, but it is not right now. It ought to be reduced more. I just do not see how or why Members on both sides of the aisle would not be glad to support the amendment. I will prophesy one thing: If this kind of legislation comes to the House a year from now, it will be a lot less than it is today. It will be reduced much more than 10 percent. We just will not have the money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the suggestion has been made that the Republican Members had agreed to this bill when it came to the floor. I served notice on the last day when we marked up the bill that there were many items I disagreed on. If the Chairman will remember on numerous occasions as we went down through the bill I said: "Let us go back to the 1932 appropriations." On numerous items that were cut down we said: "We will take so much out of travel, so much out of communications; we will make an over-all cut leaving it to the Clerk to suggest where these cuts should be made."

I call attention to another thing. Before Pearl Harbor the Secretary of the Interior asked for \$349,756,568. After Pearl Harbor, that near disaster, the Bureau of the Budget cut it \$50,000,000 below last year's bill. And then the Secretary of the Interior said: "You are pikers, I can find another \$10,000,000 in here you can cut out." Since that time the Dutch Navy has suffered considerable losses.

Since that time the Dutch East Indies have fallen; Singapore has fallen; Bataan stands by the grace of God, General MacArthur, General Wainwright, and gallant American and Philippine troops. Boys from my district share in that honor. Every day we face new sacrifices. The American people will have to reappraise the luxuries they have had. The Secretary of the Interior has been first and foremost in calling upon the American people to do without gasoline. He urged this upon them long before there was a legitimate shortage. Every hour that we fail to gain some territory in the Pacific—yes; in the four corners of the world where our troops are stationed—we are going to have to reappraise our position on these appropriations and see if we cannot cut more; see if we cannot place more men into the war-production jobs for our armed forces. I think that indicates how this subcommittee did a \$17,000,000 better job than Mr. Ickes and the Bureau of the Budget. Today I still want to cut non-defense items below the subcommittee figures.

A lot of amendments have been turned down, but next year, I promise you, we will come in here and scrape more from these items.

I want to call one other thing to your attention—that in 1941 the Interior sup-

ply bill was \$155,000,000. This bill is \$162,000,000 already, and the deficiency bill that will come up tomorrow carries a deficiency appropriation for the Interior Department for 1942; so I suggest we go through this bill now with a fine-tooth comb.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio always makes an inspiring address. The fact is he almost had me convinced until I remembered how he and some of his Republican colleagues voted in the committee to raise the bill \$2,800,000 above the Budget estimate. Where was his economy then? It is quite true the gentleman did make several splendid lectures to the committee, that he did give notice there were certain items in the bill in which he reserved the right to offer amendments to cut. Nevertheless, the gentleman was one of the prime movers in adding \$2,800,000 to the bill. I desire to make it plain that I am not criticising him for doing it because as I said a moment ago I believe the projects he voted for are desirable just like there are many other desirable and worth-while projects in the country. I am not saying that a dollar of that \$2,800,000 will be wasted; I do not think so. I am not criticising him for it at all but merely calling attention to the fact that he is making mountains where there are not even any molehills.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 36, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boulder Dam National Recreational Area, Ariz. and Nev.: For administration, protection, improvement, and maintenance of the recreational activities of the Boulder Dam National Recreational Area and any lands that may be added thereto by Presidential or other authority, including not exceeding \$800 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles, \$91,375.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### A CHALLENGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, with threats of civil strife if Congress persists in making it possible for every American citizen, by his work here at home, to support the men in the fighting line, Philip Murray and William Green, presidents of the C. I. O. and the A. F. L., have challenged the courage and the patriotism of every Member of Congress.

That is a challenge which we should not delay in accepting. Hitlerism, whether it be practiced in Germany by Hitler or here in America by labor dictators, is equally unthinkable. Hitler com-

pels men and women to work when and where he wills. Murray and Green tell us that no man or woman shall work without becoming members of their organizations and paying into their treasuries the sums they demand.

Let us for the moment forget pay and a half, double pay, the 40-hour week, and get down to the basic issue—the closed shop.

The closed shop smacks of Hitlerism. The President told us he never would force it upon the American worker. Nevertheless, through an arbitration board, with Steelman acting as his representative, he did that thing less than 20 days later.

Today 15,000 free-born, liberty-loving American citizens, if they would work here at home in support of our fighting men, are being forced to bow to the will of, and pay the price exacted by, the American Federation of Labor, or forego the jobs which are offered and which they can perform at Camp Pickett, Va. That charge is made by Governor Darden, of Virginia. It is substantiated by the investigation of State Labor Commissioner John H. Hall. We learn from his report that initiation fees and monthly dues charged to individual members of the various unions employed at Camp Pickett are as follows:

Carpenters and joiners, \$30, \$2; operating engineers, \$30.45, \$4; painters and decorators, \$25, \$2; teamsters and truck drivers, \$10, \$2.25; electrical workers, \$25, \$5; sheet-metal workers, \$50, \$2.50; glaziers, \$25, \$2; plumbers and steamfitters, \$55, \$2.50; asbestos workers, \$100, \$3; elevator constructors, \$200, \$2.50; iron workers, \$12.75, \$4.50; metal lathers, \$50, \$2.50; cement finishers, \$100, \$2; laborers, \$6, \$1.50.

Yesterday it was that Green and Murray, presidents of the A. F. L. and the C. I. O., according to the press, told the American people that, if they insisted upon exercising their God-given, their constitutional right to assist in the defense of their country without meeting the demands of these two unions, civil strife would come to this land of ours.

Here are two men, spokesmen for two organizations—two organizations which insist that only their members shall be gainfully employed—threatening to start a civil war here at home, while the Nation is sending hundreds of thousands of its finest young men to fight and die on every continent, on every sea, the world over.

Yes, cowards and lacking in patriotism are we, if we fail to meet this challenge without further delay.

Philip Murray, testifying before the House Naval Affairs Committee in opposition to labor legislation, said:

That the committee had the responsibility of correcting misinformation that has been sponsored and fostered by antilabor groups \* \* \* and of rebuking once and for all those in public life and in private life who are attempting to disrupt and divide our Nation into groups.

The only individuals, the only groups, whose activities disrupt and divide our Nation on this question are Mr. Murray and Mr. Green and those who with them

contend that their organizations shall have a monopoly of defense work.

Said William Green on the same occasion, and I quote:

I charge that the sponsors and supporters of this bill are now waging an undeclared war against President Roosevelt and against the workers of America who believe in the policies of his administration.

How absurd is that statement in view of the record of these two labor organizations.

Who was it who, in 1937, invaded the State of Michigan and with armed goon squads beat into submission the workers of General Motors at Flint, Mich.? Who was it who took possession of some of the cities of Michigan and by force maintained possession for weeks—yes, for months? Who was it who carried on that undeclared war against civil authority? It was the C. I. O., of which Murray is the head.

Who is it who today is carrying on, in the city of New York, an undeclared war, civil strife, by means of which its members stop the trucks of honest farmers seeking to carry food and produce to the inhabitants of New York City; hold them up and by force and violence rob them before permitting them to use the highways and streets of that city? None other than the Teamster's Union affiliated with the A. F. of L., of which Mr. William Green is the president.

Talk about war! For weeks, for months—yes, for years—these two organizations, with the approval of their presidents—for they have not stopped the practice—have been carrying on an undeclared war, a war of violence, a war of beatings, of killings of defenseless, unprotected, law-abiding citizens. They have practiced extortion. They have practiced what one Justice of the United States Supreme Court characterized as highway robbery—not on one occasion, but day after day, month after month, and year after year.

And now, brazenly, while the country is fighting for its life, after we have suffered almost irreparable losses in the Pacific, while Churchill says we are losing the Battle of the Atlantic through the sinkings by submarines, these two men, claiming to be patriotic, loyal American citizens, have the effrontery to declare that, unless they and their organizations are permitted to continue the practice of extortion, of graft, which they have been carrying on, no man, no woman, can work here at home in support of MacArthur and his armed forces; in support of our Air Corps, of our Navy.

All who oppose their demands for a monopoly over all workers, they charge, are creating discontent and but little veiled is their threat that, unless the Federal Government yields to their unlawful, their exorbitant, their un-American and their unjust demands, they will bring about civil strife.

If that be their attitude, then we should challenge them to bring on that strife without further delay and before, through their acts in weakening our national defense, Hitler and Hirohito have reached our shores.

Said William Green:

We cannot afford in the Nation's crisis to take time out to fight another and undeclared war among ourselves here in America.

His acts show that the alternative is a submission by our people and our Government to his rule, to his demands.

As just stated, the record of the past shows who, with blackjack, with lead pipe, with bludgeon, with stones, brickbats, and guns, has made war upon American workmen, American workingwomen.

Let Murray and Green, or either of them, name one individual who is supporting the present proposed labor legislation who has, by word or act, advocated or committed any act of violence against any laboring man.

Those who have gone forth to beat, to maim, and to kill, to destroy property and deprive workers of their jobs, have been pickets and the goon squads of these two labor organizations.

Overlong has the American Federation of Labor harbored convicted racketeers and criminals. Overlong has the C. I. O. placed in positions of power and in control of vast sums of money known Communists and advocates of the overthrow of our Government by force.

For years, farmers, tillers of the soil, driving, in their own motor vehicles, their produce to the markets in our cities, have, by force and violence and threats of force and violence, been compelled to stand and deliver a part of their hard-earned money to the agents of the American Federation of Labor.

Now, when the fate of our Nation is at stake, these men declare that if we throw open the gates of our factories, of our mills, and our mines, throw open the gates of the yards which surround our cantonments, so that law-abiding, loyal, patriotic American citizens, with sons and brothers and relatives in the armed forces, can go into those places of employment and work to preserve the life of the Nation, there will be civil strife.

They ask more than does Hitler, Hirohito, or Mussolini. For the present at least all those three enemies of our country are asking is that we get out and stay out of the lands adjacent to their territories. These two men go further than they and tell us that we cannot work in our own industries, in our own cantonments; that we cannot make the shells, the guns, the tanks, and the planes which are vitally necessary if we are to win this war, until they have collected all sums which they consider they need or desire; until we have signed on the dotted line and acknowledged their rule.

Hitlerism at least is some distance away and the war with him is in the open, as it is with Japan. These men announce that we shall have war here at home and that challenge of theirs, uttered yesterday, should be accepted and answered in the characteristic American way. They should be told that Americans who fight for freedom on all the seven seas and on every continent will fight for freedom here at home.

If this Congress has courage and patriotism, it will at the earliest possible moment accept this challenge by legis-

lation which will protect the American worker, who, after all, is patriotic and who does not by any means subscribe to the doctrine of these two who so misrepresent patriotic American labor as to demand that the American brother and the American father cannot, without their permission, support the brother or son who is offering up his life in the defense of all.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Travel Bureau: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to encourage travel in the United States and for other purposes", approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 773-774), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses incident to participation by the Travel Bureau in international exhibitions and conferences dealing with travel; printing and binding; books, newspapers, and periodicals, \$9,820.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 119, line 8, strike out all of lines 8 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill an item of \$9,820 for a Travel Bureau. I realize it seems to be more or less a matter of formality to offer amendments for a reduction of any of these items. The inference I gathered a few minutes ago was to the effect that since the committee saw fit to bring in these figures, it was not up to the Members of the House to raise very much question as to whether the item should or should not be allowed. Of course, if we are expected to abide entirely by the decision of the committee, admitting they are very competent, when they bring the bill to the floor of the House, what is the use of debating the bill at all? Why not vote "yea" or "nay" and let it go at that, or why not take the recommendation of the committee and not even have a vote, if that is the attitude we are expected to take?

Let me call your attention to this item for the Travel Bureau. Somebody got a bright idea about a year ago and thought we ought to have a Travel Bureau, so this Congress agreed to spend about \$75,000 to encourage travel in the United States through a new streamlined bureau. A fine new establishment was set up in Washington, together with some branch offices.

As I understand it, the thing did not go over big. They spent about \$45,000, and there is still \$30,000 unexpended. That ought to be put back in the Treasury or they will spend that. Even the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to reduce the amount to \$20,000. Then the committee thought it had better not destroy the whole thing, so they made it \$9,820. They just did not have the courage to eliminate it. Looks as though they, or someone, thought some fine day they might want to revive it. So we have an office down here, and we have to employ somebody to keep it open, pay



them a salary, and also the salary of a secretary, probably. They put out a little bit of literature. Goodness alive, the thing was only conceived a year ago. We certainly don't need it now.

We do not want to spend any money on travel this year, and especially the Federal Government. Why, on the face of the very thing, it is bad. Let us cut it out and if next year or some time after this war, when and if it is over, you want to establish this kind of a thing and think you can afford to and you believe the taxpayers of this country want it, all right, but let us shut it up before it spends any more of the taxpayers' money that they don't have. Since this Bureau can't be defended on need for war effort, it will probably be suggested that we should have it to connect with a "good neighbor" policy. That is an excuse. We are spending millions of dollars for that purpose in other respects. This \$9,820 will not help much in that regard. It will just pay the salary of two people, that's all.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman, of course, knows that the day is not far off when the Government may have to ration travel because of lack of equipment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Why, sure. Our people are being told they should not travel any more than necessary. We must save the cars, the tires, and the gasoline. Train travel is about to be discouraged to give way to those who must go. The first thing we know, there will be a bureau set up at the expense of the Government advising the public not to travel. The very idea of the existence of such a thing as a Travel Bureau, at a cost of approximately \$10,000 is not good.

This is one time when we ought to forget there is an aisle down through the middle of the House and vote for this amendment. It is only \$9,820 but it will buy an airplane. I do not think many Members even knew we had a Travel Bureau until they read this bill. I do not think anybody can get up here and defend the use our people had out of that Bureau during the year we had it, and which has cost the taxpayers of this country \$45,000 already. I wish someone would tell us just where the \$45,000 was spent and what for. It would be interesting to know, especially before we spend any more money on it.

There are two things involved here. One is to save the money and the other is the very principle of the thing. Let us just cut this out. Let us show we are willing to cut one thing out that does not have anything to do with national defense. Furthermore, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, I do not see how you can vote against my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Was this Bureau created for the purpose of encouraging travel in the United States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is as I understand it and that is what the hearings tell us.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the policy of the Government now was to discourage travel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman agrees with me. I think that is correct, and that is the reason we ought to cut this particular item out. This is not an old, established Bureau. This is just what somebody thought of a year ago and it was put in here. I do not know why it came in here in the first place. The hearings do not even disclose what services were rendered from the \$45,000 that has already been spent. It should also be noted that the Department of the Interior, through other bureaus, is spending thousands of dollars in publicizing and advertising the many attractive places that come within its jurisdiction. Here is a chance to vote out \$10,000 and save that much money.

I hope the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations will agree to my amendment and not try to defend this kind of an item. It just does not look good on the face of it. Of course, somebody is going to lose a rather fat salary for a rather easy job. A stenographer or secretary will have to get another job. That will not be difficult. They will probably tell you they want to encourage the South Americans to come up here and travel around. Those people are going to be too busy to spend much in travel during the next year. I do not think \$9,820 spent for a couple of employees in a Washington office will go very far for a purpose of that kind. We need to save the \$9,820. The spending of it will not do the taxpayers of this country much good. It should be used for better purposes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have 5 of those minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I want 5 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] wants 5 minutes, but I shall be glad to split my time.

Mr. DITTER. I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma will agree with me that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have used very little time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman, and I also agree that whenever the gentleman speaks he is always listened to with a great deal of interest.

Mr. DITTER. That is a very gracious compliment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is one of the most effective speakers on the floor of the House, and I shall not ask him to cut any of his time. I shall give the gentleman from California 4 of my minutes, and close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should first like to have the RECORD show that with few exceptions the majority has opposed every effort that has been made by the minority to bring about economies in the administration of the Department of the Interior. A very determined demand is evidenced throughout the country for economy in government. The people are demanding economy and efficiency. These teller votes and the aye and no votes do not give the full record. It should be of record that the minority has made efforts to economize but that every one of these efforts has been met with the almost solid opposition of the majority. Spending has become a fixed habit with the majority.

As to the amendment before us, my distinguished friend from Oklahoma will remember that this is the item having to do with the pamphlet, the pamphlet of confusion, to which I directed the attention of the House yesterday. It is the activity that urges us to travel, to become nomads, wanderers, and rovers, when we have no gasoline and no rubber. What possible objection could there be to the elimination of the activity in its entirety? That is what this amendment seeks to do. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from New York—and I know that the Department of the Interior is close to his heart—and to my friend from Oklahoma, who has been most zealous for the interests of the Secretary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I believe and the majority party believes in sound economy, but I do not believe in political economy, which you on the minority side are practicing.

Mr. DITTER. My friend fails to answer. There is no such thing as economy in the New Deal. My question is this. What harm could there be in the elimination of this activity in its entirety? Does the gentleman approve of the publication of pamphlets telling America to travel, when we have neither the gasoline nor the rubber to do it? In other words, would it not be wise to eliminate conflict between Mr. Henderson on the one hand and Mr. Ickes on the other? I should like my very able and distinguished friend from New York to answer that question. What harm could there be? What loss would there be?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming the gentleman went into the national parks to visit, would he not like to receive a pamphlet issued by the Park Service giving him information which would enable him to see the beauties of that particular park?

Mr. DITTER. My understanding is that such publications are not provided for by this \$10,000. This \$10,000 provides for the confusions which I believe the gentleman from New York was willing to admit yesterday were foolish. That is what this \$10,000 is for, to publish the contradictions and confusions of the New Deal—pure waste.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has spent probably more than \$195 in talking about this item, and that is what these pamphlets cost about which

the gentleman raises his voice so vociferously at this time. At the same time, I point out that when it comes to real funds, everything is silent, silent as the grave. The gentleman is talking about \$195, when this committee has already reduced this travel bureau item from \$75,000 to less than \$10,000.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman will not take all my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thought I was taking a little more time than the gentleman wanted me to take.

Mr. DITTER. I have this to say in answer to the gentleman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be using \$195 worth of printing in connection with the opposition that is presently being made by him, but I believe \$195,000 and more might well be saved if a few more on the other side of the aisle would be articulate and active in their opposition to the extravagances of this administration. I regret, and it is to be deplored that the gentleman from Oklahoma can find no better justification than that to which he has resorted. My question has not been answered. To attempt to turn the subject on to the costs of the debates here in the House is a confession of weakness. The truth of the matter is—there is no answer—no reason why the activity as a whole could not be cut from the people, and no one would mourn the loss other than the pay rollers who get the benefit.

The question involved here is not the saving of \$195. It goes much deeper than that. The problem here is the elimination of an activity that has no useful function to perform at this time—to make a start at house cleaning here in Washington—to get rid of the parasites that have fastened themselves on the public pay roll and who are extremely reluctant to let go. The problem can be solved in one way—to set about the job of separating these agencies which have no present excuse for existence from the public purse. Instead of coddling them by hunting for some excuse for their existence, close them up and save men and money and materials. It can be done if there is a will to do it.

I confess that I do not know what my friends mean by the phrase "political economy," as contrasted with what they term "sound economy." I am familiar as a result of my experience here in the House during the last 8 years with political profligacy, with political spending, with political bounties, but I have seen little or nothing which impresses me as a genuine effort to save money—to economize—to make \$1 do the work of two—to save if an excuse could be found to spend. The best evidence at hand to substantiate this assertion is an examination of the public debt at the beginning of this administration and at the close of the second term. That may represent "sound economy" to some men, but to me it is the indication of an unsound, an unwise, and a loose fiscal policy—a wasting of a national substance in riotous living.

I shall not dwell at length on the reference to the costs entailed in carrying on debates in the House. Suffice it to

say that as long as I am a Member of the House I shall not be intimidated by a suggestion that free and full debate on controversial subjects must be measured on a dollar basis—that the merits or demerits of a proposal dare not be discussed because of the cost of reporting the debates. Rubber stamps may be less expensive in the costs of recording the proceedings of this body, but my conviction is that we would be a wealthier people today had we had fewer rubber stamps in days gone by.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I believe the opposition to the Travel Bureau is shortsighted. The 21 republics of North and South America have united in organizing an Inter-American Travel Conference that is engaged in promoting understanding and better political and business relations between North and South America. Each of these countries has an agency similar to our Travel Bureau. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] was a delegate to that conference at Mexico City last year. He speaks in the highest terms of the work and associations of that conference as beneficial to our country. Another conference is set to meet in the capital of Argentina in September of this year. The gentleman from North Carolina states that men of the highest type in the 21 republics—and this year including Canada—are going to engage in that conference.

These other American countries are all contributing to the support of agencies established by their governments to carry on such work as is done by our Travel Bureau. Many nations of the world have engaged in such activities for years. Canada has raised its appropriation this year for this purpose from \$350,000 to \$500,000. The United States has an annual travel bill of \$7,000,000,000. Would it not be poor judgment to force representatives of our Government when they go to Argentina to engage in this conference to admit that the United States is the only 1 of the 21 republics of North and South America that fails to cooperate in its relation to the travel problem? That travel must have so much to do with promoting understanding and business relations with our sister republics.

The appropriation has already been reduced from \$75,000 to less than \$10,000. Fifty-five thousand dollars of that was reduced by voluntary action of the Department as a concession to war conditions. The committee itself further reduced it to about \$10,000. I think that was a mistake to reduce it so much. But if we considered it only from the standpoint of the domestic situation in promoting travel, it would be important to preserve at least a skeleton organization. In the last 25 years I have traveled into every State in the Union, sometimes for business, sometimes for pleasure, and always for my benefit. From my experience in traveling I am satisfied the Travel Bureau can do and is doing a useful work.

The work of the Bureau is mainly in coordinating information for the benefit of the traveler. It has little to do with producing printed material and expenses of that kind, but it serves a good purpose in supplying useful travel information from original sources without publication by it. It is particularly useful in contacting and coordinating travel information between our States and the other American countries. It is a promoter of understanding, good will, and better business relations.

I see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is here and I would like to have him speak further within the time allotted to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not cut this appropriation. Practically nine-tenths of this amount of \$9,820 will go to pay the expenses of our attending and participating in international expositions in the western republics.

Just listen to me a minute. We have neglected these countries for years and years, until the business was taken away from us and until there arose among the people of the western republics a real antipathy and dislike toward the United States. This statement is undoubtedly true, and I think every man in this House realizes this. We are now attempting to overcome whatever feeling of neglect there is on our part toward our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere by cultivating these people and by stimulating spiritual, commercial, and friendly relations and by promoting unity between us all, a unity which will vouchsafe the political safety and welfare of all the western republics. This is one of the finest things we can possibly do and most of this item goes for these purposes alone. The money is not used for pamphlets or for advertisements or for papers, but to pay the expenses of representatives of this country to a congress that meets and considers the beneficial relationships which should exist between all the people of this great Western Hemisphere. We should have begun to cultivate such a relationship 50 or 100 years ago, and this Nation would be better off today if we had done this, as well as all other republics of the New World. I trust that the good sense of this committee will not allow this item to be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim that this Committee is infallible.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Not now.

It has made mistakes, but I call attention to the fact that every administrative item in this bill has been cut and reduced drastically. Some of them have been cut as much as 75 percent. It held hearings for 1 month, every day, including Saturdays, and I am sure the committee was in agreement on this item that we reduced more than 75 percent. So it just occurs to me, inasmuch as this item has already been reduced from \$75,000 to below \$10,000, inasmuch as every travel item in the bill has been reduced, and remembering, too, that we have cut the park service



\$9,000,000, that the present figure should stand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 41, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Food habits of birds and animals: For investigating the food habits and economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals, \$50,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 124, line 21, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out the item which provides for an expenditure of \$50,000 which is contained in this bill for investigating the food habits of birds. The item is captioned "Food habits of birds and animals."

I believe that the time has come when the American people are no longer willing to tolerate an expenditure of this kind. I am not in favor of permitting an agency of the Government to go on a wild-goose chase or on a snipe hunt. I wonder if the Department is trying to find out who killed Cock Robin or if it is endeavoring to ascertain how much wood would a woodchuck chuck if a woodchuck would chuck wood.

This is just an absurd expenditure of public funds. The idea of spending \$50,000 to investigate the food habits of birds. How can Members of Congress stand before the country in this emergency and defend an expenditure of Federal funds for such a purpose?

I was very much surprised, upon an examination of the record, to find that the Department spent \$80,000 last year investigating the habits of birds.

The report indicates that "extensive records of the economic relationships of foreign birds and animals are maintained to guide in the determination of departmental action with respect to proposed importation of foreign species." The record clearly fails to disclose a justification for this item. If the Department has not been able to find out all that they want to find out about the food habits of birds with the tremendous appropriations which have already been provided, then I suggest that they call in some farm boy from down in North Carolina to give them full information regarding the subject What Birds Feed On.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman said that they appropriated \$80,000 for this particular thing last year.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Did it ever occur to the gentleman from North Carolina that they set up a fund to carry on some of these experiments, and that they

never do arrive at any conclusion. It is like Tennyson's brook, it runs on and on forever. It will gather this information year in and year out, and still they need the money to make an experiment.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I call your attention to a news article which appeared in today's Washington Daily News, written by E. A. Evans, regarding the Interior Department contribution to war effort. I read excerpts from Mr. Evans' article:

European butterfish lay their eggs in empty oyster shells.

Old male Pacific walrus weigh from 2,000 to 3,000 pounds.

These items were taken by Mr. Evans from Current Conservation, published monthly by the Interior Department and described by the Interior Department as "A clip sheet of current news about the Federal Government's wartime conservation activities in mobilizing the Nation's natural resources for victory." In this grand publication we find the following:

The thresher shark kills its prey with its tail. The elf owl is the tiniest owl in North America, being no larger than a sparrow. The tongue of a woodpecker is longer than the bird's head. The little jumping mouse can sometimes leap as much as 10 feet in one bound. The catfish of the African swamps is the only fish which it is definitely known will swim upside down. Woodpeckers are the only birds in the United States that can dig holes in solid trees. After being A. W. O. L. for a year, a pair of Canada geese recently returned to George Washington National Monument.

The time has come to stop this foolish expenditure of public funds for these scientific articles, circulars, leaflets, and bulletins. Who cares about how long a woodpecker's tongue is or how much wood a woodpecker can peck, or how far a little mouse can jump?

I urge the adoption of my amendment which will strike from the bill this foolish and absurd item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is very easy to laugh these things off. It is so easy to be facetious and resort to ridicule. That method of debate is too often indulged in when one does not have sound argument. In my judgment the wording of the paragraph under discussion is unfortunate, but if the gentleman will investigate he will find that this activity is of considerable importance, and I may say to the gentleman that I have received telegrams and letters from some of the leading sportsmen of the country criticizing the committee and demanding that this and other items for the Fish and Wildlife Service be increased. The members of the Izaak Walton League and many other sports organizations of the country feel that this committee cut this and several other items in this bill pertaining to fish and wildlife entirely too much. This item now is \$30,700 below what was spent last year for this purpose, and then the committee cut \$21,550 below the Budget estimate. I do not believe the item should be further reduced.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman tell the Committee how much money is contained in this bill for birds? Here you

have one item for predatory birds, \$700,000; and then for the protection of migratory birds, \$342,000; and then there is another item of \$10,000—

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, the gentleman knows that there are several other items in this bill for fish and wildlife, but he also knows it has been drastically cut. Is it his wish to destroy that service? What does the gentleman desire? The Congress of the United States in its wisdom established the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is one of the most popular services in the United States, and if he thinks the people of this country are not behind it he is mistaken. The committee has already cut this and three or four other items in this bill far below the figure that any evidence would justify. Practically every item in the bill has been slashed.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is much more than a mere matter of humor, and it can be neither laughed off nor killed by ridicule. If it were entirely a matter of investigating the life and habits of a bird or some birds, it would be quite different, but this is an activity that has been carried on for years and covers all birds and animals.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Not at the moment. Ten years ago they had over \$100,000 in this item, and it does not cover merely investigating the habits of birds, but this is for investigating food habits, and the economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals. Aside from the interest of American sportsmen in the wildlife of the Nation, the birds and the animals of this Nation fall into two categories, those that are beneficial and those that are destructive to agriculture, forestry, and horticulture.

It is naturally a subject that will never come to a conclusion. It should not, because the mysteries and habits of the animal kingdom can never be fully solved. But we have now invested, rightly or wrongly, millions and millions of dollars in refuges for our wildlife. I think it a wise action.

American sportsmen are contributing millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury, much more than this entire appropriation. You may as well say that because we have two dozen or three dozen fish hatcheries and we are stocking the streams that we ought to completely eliminate that activity. Now, there is a limit to that which is economy, and when you leave economy and go into destruction—

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman referred to injurious birds in one paragraph. That is the one I am trying to strike out. In the next page you refer to predatory birds, animals, and so forth. That carries an appropriation of \$700,000.

Mr. LEAVY. Let me say to my friend that the Fish and Wildlife Service is collecting both from commercial and American sporting interests who are interested in game and wild birds, and food fish and food animals are contributing far more than we are proposing to appropriate here. Every State in the Union maintains a very large and capable fish and game department. These activities just fit into that service and coordinate their activities with the various States.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman claim that this work should go on and on forever?

Mr. LEAVY. It should go on so long as it justifies itself, and the gentleman has not shown that it is not justified.

Mr. COOLEY. I can show by the record that it has not justified itself.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the gentleman recognize that scientific men have agreed that insects are the greatest foe of the human family and that birds are the greatest protectors of the human race? Our feathered friends may save us from our enemies.

Mr. LEAVY. There is no question about it at all.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder if the gentleman would give us the amount of the unexpended balance in this item? In other words, as we were discussing this travel item a moment ago, the record showed a very substantial unexpended balance. In line with the amendment offered by the gentleman a moment ago, it would seem to me that we should know how much the unexpended balance is at the present time before the gentleman from Washington can justify the appropriation that he now endorses.

Mr. LEAVY. I cannot, on a single item like this, say what the unexpended balance is.

Mr. DITTER. Well, it is relevant, is it not?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; it is relevant. If you contend there will be an unexpended balance at the end of the year, the burden should be upon you to show what there will be. Presumptively we only appropriated enough last year to run through this fiscal year. Now we have cut that amount down about one-third for the next fiscal year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me read this for the gentleman's information. It is found in the last paragraph on page 743 of the hearings:

Of this sum \$42,832 has been allocated for the purchase of refuge land, and \$4,500 for investigation of migratory birds.

Mr. LEAVY. I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman suppose that any of the superfluous em-

ployees of this Bureau would have to go to work if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. LEAVY. No. I presume those that they have are all working, and are necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of not wanting it to appear that I want to laugh this \$50,000 off. Not for a moment. I do not think anyone wants to appear to laugh off the item of \$50,000. This is a serious matter. I think that this expenditure would do some little good. Of course, it would. It is not just for nothing at all, but is it worth it in the light of our other needs at this crucial hour? Is it worth it in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury? Is it worth it considering the demands being made on the taxpayers of this country? Had we not better use this money to feed the soldiers rather than just use it to study the food habits of birds? What do you really think about it?

I realize these sportsmen who have just been mentioned are highly patriotic citizens. If this were all the money you are spending for birds, that would make the situation somewhat different.

There are hundreds of thousands of dollars in this bill to be expended for birds.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the author of this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. The section that I offered to strike out makes no reference whatever to game birds or to sportsmen, but I think that the language is fallacious, because it tries to connect the food habit of birds with horticulture or agriculture or forestry.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. I think the question the gentleman asked a moment ago about the destruction of insects and things like that with relation to birds has nothing at all to do with this particular item.

Here is one item of expense that does not add up in any direction with the defense program. It has nothing to do with the war effort. You cannot sustain it in that respect by any stretch of the imagination. Let us strike out this \$50,000 and save that much money for far more important uses. There is still thousands of dollars in this bill being spent for birds. I know we are not going to have any roll call on this amendment, but let us use our good, common horse sense and save this \$50,000. I know the country will feel a little better if they know there is some little gesture being made toward economy in this bill. I hope you will sustain the gentleman who has offered this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the present bill larger or smaller than last year's appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, the entire bill is for more than last year, but this

particular item has been cut down to some extent.

It seems rather strange reasoning to say that because the committee cuts an item that is the reason why we ought not to cut it further. As I said a moment ago, it does seem to me that it is only fair that the members of the Committee of the Whole should have the right to give consideration to these cuts without having it suggested to them that just because the committee brings in a bill with a few cuts we should not reduce it some more. Let us not vote for any item unless we convince ourselves that it is a wise expenditure. And do it in the light of the need of the hour.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not feel that while perhaps the committee cut the bill but not as much as the gentleman himself would have cut it, yet the committee has spent a considerable amount of its time listening to the opinion of people who have been justifying these appropriations? I am wondering if the gentleman has read the hearings to the extent that he feels he is justified in making the argument he does?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I have read the hearings, and I certainly don't find anything in this evidence that convinces me that we should spend \$50,000 to study food of birds.

I know the committee did not listen to anyone else than those sustaining the expenditures. That is the trouble. Why do you not ask someone to come in and be heard on the opposite side?

Mr. LEAVY. Did the gentleman ask to appear before the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly not. But the gentleman is hardly fair. How could I know when the committee would give consideration to these particular items? I realize, as the gentleman stated, about the only ones that are heard, are those interested in these items of expenditures and in favor of them, but I am talking about John Q. Public, who does not have a chance to be present except possibly through his representative here in Congress and that is what I am trying in my humble way to do this afternoon. I do not say the committee did not exercise its best judgment, but I am saying that all of the witnesses heard justifying this expenditure are those who will benefit from the funds and those who want the activity carried on. This is a place where we can save \$50,000. It will injure no one. Those who get their salaries from this fund can be employed in far more important jobs right now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman did not appear before the committee and make such request did he?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no; certainly not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There were 30 Members of Congress who did



appear before the committee, including several Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and not one made a suggestion to cut a single item but asked for increase of items. Had the committee been guided by their suggestions we would have added several millions of dollars more than the Budget estimate, whereas we bring the bill to the House \$17,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In the first place I felt the chairman of the committee would see to it that reductions would be made where it could possibly be done. His committee did cut what is known as estimates, by a little less than 10 percent. The chairman well knows and should appreciate that it is not only the right of any Member to offer amendments to these measures when they are presented to the membership of the House. It is also his duty to do so. The inference that because a Member did not appear before the committee regarding any of these items is not justified, in my opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: Page 124, line 25, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes; but merely enough time to state, in view of what has been argued, that this is an essential service. My amendment would provide for the maintenance of at least a skeleton organization and would preserve some of the things that have been accomplished during the past few years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman point out one good thing that has been accomplished by this expenditure up to this good hour?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman will find it set forth in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. The record fails to make any such disclosure.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly much good has been done by a greater knowledge of the food habits of birds and of the food habits of animals as they affect agriculture and forestry. I know that this is the experience in the Western States where our contacts with the Department of the Interior are close. We feel the work has been of value.

Mr. COOLEY. They have issued a lot of bulletins.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. How else would they spread the knowledge of what discoveries they have made? If it is insisted that a cut must be made in this item, I maintain it should not be stricken out entirely, but enough should

be left to provide for a skeleton organization.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to call attention to the fact that this money does go for publications, articles, circulars, leaflets, and bulletins on the life and habits of birds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just to ask the gentleman if he does not feel it is more essential at this time that we study the food necessities of migratory soldiers rather than the food habits of migratory birds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the soldiers are going to be fed, and fed well. As far as I am concerned, while the committee is not in a position to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico—and I am opposed to it—I certainly would favor it over the original amendment to eliminate the item altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEAVY) there were—ayes 61, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying into effect the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act by providing funds for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas, for the protection of certain migratory birds, for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1934, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, and certain other acts relating to game and other wildlife, administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), an amount equal to the sum received during the fiscal year 1943 from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly; and in addition thereto, an amount equal to the unobligated balance on June 30, 1942, of the total of the proceeds received from the sale of stamps prior to July 1, 1942.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to this paragraph covering the migratory bird conservation fund, I want to call the attention of the committee to what is going on in the Migratory Conservation Commission, which was created by an act of Congress. The chairman of that committee is the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes. Our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is a member of that Commission and two or three United States Senators are also on the Commission. These are the gentlemen who go about the country selecting and buying land for bird sanctuaries. In view of what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said

awhile ago as to the importance at this time of thinking about arming, feeding, supporting, and maintaining an army in this awful war in which we are engaged, we are somewhat surprised to find the gentlemen who are administering this program more interested in certain species of ducks and in finding a place where they may light and rest, than in making available every possible dollar for the prosecution of this war. Down in the district which I have the honor to represent, this Commission is instituting proceedings to purchase and take out of cultivation some 33,000 acres of agricultural land at a cost of approximately \$400,000, to be converted into one of these bird sanctuaries and covered with water for a place where ducks may swim and rest for a few weeks or months during the year.

The people of those counties do not want this land taken out of cultivation because it will mean the removal of several hundred families from the land on which they now live and are supporting themselves at this time. These lands will be covered with water, converted into a malarial breeding ground, and will not produce one dollar of revenue. On the other hand, these lands will be taken off the tax rolls for purposes of taxation, and will make the tax burden of the people of those counties more difficult to bear.

I take this opportunity to let you know what is going on at a time when we are taxing ourselves to the limit to get funds to prosecute this war. If we were at peace it might be different, but at a time like this it seems sheer nonsense to remove a hundred or two hundred families from these lands and force them to go elsewhere to find homes for the sole purpose of providing a place where birds may rest. I may say that within 10 miles of this proposed sanctuary we have a 6,000-acre Government-owned lake which will provide an ideal resting place for all the birds that will ever come to that part of the country.

To show you how high-handed this commission is, one of my constituents called upon my friend and colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] for some information in regard to this proposed sanctuary that they propose to create down there in this section and it is very interesting to hear what they had to say in reply to that request. You have heard about the tail wagging the dog. Well, we have some commissions in this country now that almost wag the Government and there is little we can do about it. It is a case where the creature has become greater and stronger than the creator.

This letter of reply is from the Secretary of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and is addressed to the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute in order to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This letter reads as follows:

Your letter of February 8, accompanied by Mr. R. B. Oliver, Jr.'s, communication to you of February 7, is received. A copy of the letter has been made and the original is enclosed.

I regret to advise that the records of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission are not public, consequently much of the information desired by Mr. Oliver cannot be made available. However, I expect to be in Missouri very shortly in connection with field investigations of the Mingo project, and it is my plan to call on Mr. Oliver and others to discuss this matter.

It is my hope that I will also be able to obtain more complete information regarding the point of view of those who are opposing the project at present.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH DIEFFENBACH,  
Secretary, Migratory Bird  
Conservation Commission.

I make these remarks today in order that you gentlemen may know how some people insist on spending money at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Speaker of the House did appoint me a member of this commission. I have attended every meeting of the commission since my appointment. I made some suggestions to the commission in reference to getting additional information before land was purchased. For instance, I requested information about the tax value of the land, and so forth, so that we might know that we were going in the right direction, and all this without suggestion from anyone.

At the last meeting of the commission when the proposal was up to purchase this land that my colleague speaks of, nearly \$400,000 are involved, and in all 33,000 acres, including acreage that is not in the gentleman's district but in an adjoining district, I wanted to know when the survey had been made. I was informed that it was made in 1935.

I called attention to the fact that since that survey was made a flood-control dam had been constructed down there in the gentleman's district. I also stated it was my understanding that dam had protected that section of the country and it was unfair now to buy that land upon a survey made in 1935. I insisted upon another survey being made. After considerable arguing, they agreed to make a second survey and they sent some men down there to make the survey.

When I received that letter from the secretary of the commission, it was the first time I knew the records of that commission were not available to the public. I wish to assure the membership of the House that if it is within my power, at the next meeting of the commission, those records are going to be made available to the public. Nobody has a right to spend public funds and say that nobody else may look into the manner in which the funds are being spent. I know I am not going to be a party to that. I am not going to remain on a commission that maintains secret records and will

not let the general public know what it is doing with the public money.

This money is not appropriated, it comes from the migratory bird conservation fund, which is raised by the sale of duck stamps; but regardless of how it gets there, it should be spent properly. It should not be wasted. I already have the assurance of the Secretary of the Interior, who is chairman of the Commission, that at the next meeting of the Commission the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], in whose district this proposed refuge is located, will have an opportunity to be heard. I am not convinced that this property should be purchased, in view of the fact that the Wappapello Dam has been constructed and that the land down there is no longer subject to overflow as it was prior to the time the dam was constructed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman inform the House if the goose that laid the golden egg is a migratory bird?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the gentleman will have to ask the gander as to that. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure every Member of the House appreciates the fine and unselfish service the gentleman, as a member of this important Commission, is rendering. As I understand, there are two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate on this Commission, and they review the activities of this agency. I would like to have the names of those gentlemen placed in the RECORD. I can say that the House feels that this Commission will review every item and see that no money is wasted or foolishly expended.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope the Members of the House and the Senate who are members of this commission will stand together and not approve the purchase of any land that they feel should not be purchased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That expresses my opinion exactly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman feel that at this time we ought not to go down there and condemn land upon which people are now living and supporting themselves, turn it into a bog or lake, and force those people to go elsewhere and reestablish themselves, when we are trying to produce all the food we can?

Mr. COCHRAN. My answer to the gentleman is that without any suggestion from anybody I have stopped the purchase of this land. That shows my attitude on it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I commend the gentleman for taking this attitude.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of the Governor and employees incident to the execution of the acts of March 3, 1917 (48 U. S. C. 1391), and June 22, 1936 (48 U. S. C. 1405v), traveling expenses of officers and employees, necessary janitor service, care of Federal grounds, repair and preservation of Federal buildings and furniture, purchase of equipment, stationery, lights, water, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including not to exceed \$5,000 for purchase, including exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$4,000 for personal services, household equipment and furnishings, fuel, ice, and electricity necessary in the operation of Government House at St. Thomas and Government House at St. Croix, \$147,980.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 136, line 15, after "Saint Croix", strike out "\$147,980" and insert "\$32,980."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am just like the average American citizen; I am sick and tired of paying deficits. You will find that the American citizens are going to be more sick as the days go by of paying our own deficits, but I hate to think that we have to pay the deficit each year of the Virgin Islands. And why do we have to pay it? Because the management over there is poor.

One of our former associates—Guy Swope, who comes from Harrisburg, Pa., and is a mighty good fellow—heads the office here in the District that has charge of the Virgin Islands. I talked with him yesterday on the telephone. I said, "Guy, we have to do something to stop these deficits in the Virgin Islands." He said, "You are right." I said, "Let us look at what happened in the operation of those islands last year and the year before. Last year we had a deficit of \$105,000."

Someone figures that we are going to have a deficit of \$115,000 there, and that is why I want to strike out of this item the amount that it is figured will be the deficit next year. Guy Swope is going to see that we do not have a deficit. He is going to do some work over there, and say to the Governor and those in charge of the islands, "We are going to have some real efficiency in the operation of that government and try our best to balance the budget." If we do not balance the Budget of America, we are at least going to balance the budget over in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Government has any air bases in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. RICH. Yes; we do; and they are building some more.

Let me show you another reason why we have these deficits. We started the Virgin Islands Company. We paid for that Virgin Islands Company up to 1934, \$2,546,404.50. Then we gave to that company as operating capital from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration \$200,000; from the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, \$150,000; from the Emer-



agency Relief Administration, \$168,813.27; from the Farm Security Administration—Rural Rehabilitation—\$257,531.32; from the Work Projects Administration, 1940, \$48,000, and from the Work Projects Administration, 1941, \$35,000—making a total of \$859,344.59.

Add these two totals together and you have a grand total expenditure of \$3,405,749 for the Virgin Islands Company.

We capitalized that at \$30, and we manufactured rum and sugar. Last year in the operation of that rum plant we lost \$60,456.30. If we get a good administration of the Virgin Islands Company, we shall eliminate that \$60,000 loss right off the bat. Then we have only half of it raised.

What did they do last year in the harvesting of sugar? There was a lot of sugarcane they did not harvest because they took too long to get it in and it spoiled in the field, or perhaps the Department of Agriculture might not have permitted them to harvest it, because you know we manufacture rum over in Puerto Rico and there were 250,000 tons of cane they did not take in there because the Department of Agriculture said they should not harvest it. They paid them for not harvesting that sugarcane. If they had put the amount that they put into rum into using that sugarcane, let me show you how much sugar we would have saved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. I am sorry we did not raise more sugar and less rum. We would have been helping the country right now if we had done that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I shall not delay the House more than a moment. The situation in the Virgin Islands is really a pitiable one. It is unfortunate we have so many poor people down there. I wish this were not so. I wish economic conditions there were better than they are, but somehow, I just cannot understand why the gentleman would want to interfere seriously with the government there. I might call attention to some of the testimony of the Governor. He tells about the low salaries paid there. He reminded us that some capable men with families are working in his office for as low as \$55 per month. The lowest salaries, so I am advised, paid anywhere in this Government are paid in the Virgin Islands, and the Governor pleaded for some additional funds to raise some of these low salaries and to permit him to employ some additional help. The conditions he told us about are nothing to brag about. Some of his remarks were off the record. The sanitary conditions at St. Croix are absolutely deplorable. They are worse than any place, perhaps, on the face of the earth. The Governor begged for additional help in order to clean up that situation. They have a leper colony nearby. Without going into details, I sincerely hope that members of the committee will not cut this item when I say to you that instead of providing additional funds for this activity we have cut it \$21,305 below last year's appropriation, and we have also made a cut of \$570 in travel pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much of the time of the House at this time of the day, but there are some things here that ought to be considered. There is first the question of salaries. If you will look on page 811 of the hearings you will find, if I am not mistaken, that they increased those salaries about 25 percent. The interesting thing about that is that you increased the higher salaries more than you did the lower salaries. I mention that because of the plea made by the distinguished chairman of the committee. It seems to me if we need to spend money down there in the Virgin Islands to help these poor people we may as well grant the money to them rather than spend thousands of dollars on a rum plant. I understand we spent \$60,000 on that, and that certainly is not helping the poor people of the Virgin Islands or of this country.

My understanding is that one of the reasons you have a big deficit here is because you do not tax these big sugar operators down there. These big sugar plantations are not paying their fair share of the taxes. This is the main reason you are losing money. If you could get proper taxes out of them, you would get along all right.

The views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be sustained. For years the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a gallant fight against this use of the taxpayers' money. The United States Government should not be in the business of manufacturing rum. Just think of it. You had better give them twice that much money than let it be used for making liquor. I wish I had the time to discuss this whole problem. Right now we are in this war and we need the sugar. You are going to ration the sugar on the family table and yet the Government right now allows big manufacturers to use the sugar down there to make liquor and then have it sold in this country. We are producing more liquor than we ever have before. Last year the amount that was produced was increased and the amount is higher for the first 3 months of this year. Thousands of gallons of this stuff is imported here every year. We ought to sustain the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It will be said this money or appropriation is not for rum. No; but it is to take up a deficit caused by the use of Federal funds that are used to subsidize the rum business to the extent of \$60,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that, so far as I am personally concerned, I agree with him with reference to his views on the rum issue; but that has nothing whatever to do with this appropriation. There is not a dollar in this appropriation for the rum business.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The Virgin Islands have gone into the red \$60,000 each year and the deficit comes from this rum company. What are you going to do when you are paying off these deficits?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is not a dollar in this bill for the company to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the trouble is this, that you would not have a deficit if you did not spend the money for making rum, and that is all there is to it. You just cannot get around that. The Federal Treasury is short \$60,000 because the Government is in the rum business. It would at least be more commendable if the product were used for alcohol, so much needed in the making of war materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do not say that I make it. I do not make it; I am not responsible for it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly he does not make it. I refer to him only as being in charge of this legislation. The Government is the one that is in the business. As the chairman of this subcommittee, I know the gentleman from Oklahoma pretty well. As a matter of fact, I do not think he favors the Government being in the rum business any more than I do.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Appropriations herein made shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of vehicles generally known as quarter-ton or half-ton pick-up trucks and as station wagons without such vehicles being considered as passenger-carrying vehicles and without the cost of purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair being included in the limitation in the various appropriation items for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 138, after line 21, insert a new section, as follows: "None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for these purposes, namely:

- "1. Publications not required by law;
- "2. Press service;
- "3. Radio broadcasting;
- "4. Group contacts;
- "5. Exhibits;
- "6. Motion pictures;
- "7. Lantern slides and lecture material;
- "8. Photography;
- "9. Individual contacts;
- "10. Posters.

"And the amounts submitted by the Department of the Interior, Division of Information, for these purposes shall not be available therefor, and shall be recovered into the Treasury."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the committee to describe this amendment. I discussed it in the early part of the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. The

total amount for the Office of Information in the Department of the Interior is \$2,430,770, as reported by the Division of Information of that Department. The correspondence of the Department of the Interior is \$216,713 of the total of \$2,430,770. The rest is for publications, group contacts—whatever they are—individual contacts, motion pictures, radio programs, photography, lantern slides, and lecture material. All of these things could be cut out since Pearl Harbor. I submit that with the enormous expenditure in the Office of Government Reports, with the enormous expenditure in the Office of Facts and Figures—and it might be referred to as facts and fiction—under the direction of Mr. MacLeish that we do not need to have propaganda agencies in all of the departments, including this one.

There has been steadily growing in Washington a large army of men and women on full-time and part-time compensation to glamorize the activities of the bureaus they represent. Many bureaus that have nothing to do with defense try to get their noses under the tent. So many nondefense bureaus have asked for increased appropriations that their pleas of national defense are commonly referred to as the national prayer.

When we became a united people on December 7 the chairmen of both great political parties sounded a welcome note to the ears of the American people. It was generally headlined throughout the country, "No politics during the duration." But ladies and gentlemen, there was another group that never laid down their pens—2,995 of them working full time and 34,513 working part time. In many instances their only function appears to be to demand appropriations in order to keep themselves in jobs. They represent a political philosophy which is not in tune with either the Republican or Democratic Parties. I have read many of their pamphlets. I have seen duplication after duplication. News reporters have shown me the stuff that they throw in their wastebasket, and have told me they do it day after day. Virtually tons of it are poured out, not only in Washington, but in the field offices throughout the country.

So that you may have some idea of the extent of the activity of the propaganda agencies, I will tell you there are 3,096 counties in the United States. If you eliminate the counties in the solid South, which have no Republican organization and virtually only one party, you could give to every Republican or Democratic county committeeman in the United States a salary for writing political material every day in the year. You could give every Republican or Democratic district committeeman in the United States a salary to send out his political material every day in the year. In addition to that you could give every Republican or Democratic State central committeewoman a salary for sending out political material every day in the year. You could hire 10 more Republican or Democratic central committeemen in each county for part-time work and then pay the whole lot a pay roll of \$27,700,000 a year and give them \$2,500,000

worth of paper and \$49,000,000 worth of postage. Then you would have an idea of what political activity and propaganda at Government expense means to the taxpayer of this Nation.

We have modestly cut the Information Service in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. We have cut the publication of the Yearbook for the farmers. Let us make the same record on the Interior Department. So far we have only cut \$100,000 out of this \$2,400,000 monstrosity. I contend that it is bad and indefensible for you gentlemen on the other side, again asking for an adjournment of politics, to vote for this propaganda service, paid for by every man who labors, toils, and sweats to buy bonds and arm our men in blue and khaki. Why keep 115 men on the pay roll for full time and 1,918 for part time, to spread propaganda for the administration at public expense?

Mr. STEFAN. Are any of these items tied up with national defense?

Mr. JONES. There definitely is not an item that will help a soldier or a sailor to protect himself from the enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, if the membership will just note the territory embraced in this proposed amendment, and give a second thought to it, they will see that it would actually destroy the usefulness of the whole Interior Department.

As I said at the time we began consideration of this bill, when we began the reading of it, Secretary Ickes, the head of the Interior Department, is an outstanding man. I go further now and state he will go down in history, when the history of this stormy period is impartially written, as one of the great men of his time. Some men disagree with him, and other men are ardent supporters of him. That he is an honest, capable, efficient public servant has never been questioned by anyone. Some persons dislike him and some groups dislike him. I respect him for the enemies he has made. He has made an exceptional fight insofar as the West is concerned to see to it that the resources of the marvelous western country are preserved and utilized, and that includes the territory of Alaska, for the benefit of all the people. He has been a bitter opponent of the exploitation of that region for the benefit of a few. To carry on that type of fight, of necessity engenders opposition and it engenders opposition that is powerful, opposition that is going to make itself felt and heard everywhere.

I would be the last person in the world to charge any Member of this House as opposing the Secretary of the Interior because of opposition from the outside, but I do state that many Members are misled by statements made as facts, that are only biased utterances of individuals, who have felt the righteous wrath of the Secretary, when they sought advantage or special privilege. These statements are given in the press, on the radio, and elsewhere concerning the Department of the Interior, and they are accepted as true by some Members, and then they

fight from that position and they argue from that point. Harold L. Ickes does not need to be defended. His public career has been a just and righteous one and speaks far more eloquently than the words of any man.

Now, coming to the amendment in question, I am sure that those on the left side of the aisle just as well as those on the right side, do not believe for a moment that this Government, in a period even when we would practice economy to the extreme, can function without an active, energetic, wide-awake Interior Department. Now, if you believe that, you certainly cannot support this amendment. If you want to destroy that Department or so weaken it as to make it useless, then this is the type of amendment that will do just that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to approve 100 percent what the gentleman has said about Secretary Ickes. I lived in the West since 1904. I know that Secretary Ickes is the best friend of the western country that has ever occupied the position of Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LEAVY. I know he is the type of man who fights to the last ditch a course of conduct that has been exposed in the last 48 hours with reference to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and their dealings with the German dye works. He has had that same battle and fought it for us in connection with aluminum and magnesium where they had a similar arrangement in reference to those metals with the same German dye works. His heroic battle for the people against special privilege in the electric power field is common knowledge.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JONES. Is not the head Oil Coordinator under Mr. Ickes one of the officials of the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Mr. LEAVY. That may be. I do not say—neither does the gentleman from Ohio—that everybody who is an official of the Standard Oil Co. is necessarily dishonest or crooked or a traitor to the cause of this country at this critical time, any more than I would say that they were in other monopolistic activities. I do say no one can, in good conscience, defend the makers of material, or producers of it, who will barter away the rights of the Nation to its enemies, as recent revelations have disclosed as to octane gas, rubber, aluminum, and magnesium.

This amendment ought to be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder who there is in this Hall who thinks that it is a necessity to send out propaganda picture books to maintain the De-



partment of the Interior? When you get down to that point you are down to the point where you recognize and admit that there is no merit in much of its operations.

I have here one picture book of 300 pages. Another picture book that comes out every month, of about 20 pages. That is just a minor factor in the propaganda that is put out by the Department of the Interior. Are we ever going to get to the point where we are honest with the people back home and are ready to cut out the foolish expenditure of the people's money?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true also that the Government Printing Office is overtaxed now with matters pertaining to defense and the necessary functions of Government?

Mr. TABER. To the extent that the Government Printing Office is sending out questionnaires to every private printer all over the country, peddling orders all over. That means it is absolutely ridiculous at this time for us to be spending two and a half million dollars on propaganda in the Department of the Interior.

Now, do not vote on this because somebody wants you to. Vote on it because you want to do the right thing by the people back home. I have heard people on the floor state that we must cut out these nondefense expenditures. This is worse than nondefense. It is absolutely nonsensical and ridiculous and it is absolutely a breach of faith with our people for us to sit here and consent that two and a half million dollars of the people's money be spent on propaganda and printing and all kinds of foolish literature that is not necessary to maintain the problems of the Government.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted by a unanimous vote. It is an amendment that the committee ought to accept instead of talking against.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is no news to this House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has no particular love for the Secretary of the Interior. He has demonstrated that on many previous occasions. These pamphlets that he talks so vociferously about, or similar ones, have been held up here many times in the past. We had a thousand-dollar speech a while ago on a \$195 pamphlet. The gentleman from New York and others will continue to talk about pamphlets until they can rake up some other excuse to snipe at this bill. No one knows better than the gentleman from New York just how far reaching the pending amendment is.

For example, the first item mentioned in that amendment would prohibit the printing of any kind of publications not actually and specifically authorized. That, of course, is an absurdity on the face of it. What he really wants to do is to destroy the office of the Secretary of the Interior. This committee reduced

the appropriation for printing in the Department \$62,000. We did not just talk to the galleries or for home consumption. We did business.

Now, they talk about radio, as if the Department were buying a lot of radio time. Surely the gentlemen know better. The Department, of course, is not buying radio time. It is not necessary to do so. Their programs are so fine, so patriotic, so educational, and constructive that many of the large radio stations have requested the Department of the Interior for some of their programs. That means, of course, that the public likes and demands more of such programs. Not a dollar is in this bill for the Interior Department for radio time, yet you would think from some of these statements that most of this money went for radio time. And so it is quite obvious that about 99 percent of the opposition to this bill is directed actually against an honest, fearless, and capable Government official, the Secretary of the Interior.

Again I call your attention to the fact that not one of the gentlemen who have criticized the Secretary of the Interior have commended him for voluntarily cutting his own budget \$10,000,000 below the original Budget estimate. That is a record on which I challenge my Republican friends, a great many of whom evidently get up an hour early every morning to hate President Roosevelt and his great far-sighted Secretary of the Interior. I challenge them to go back to any Republican administration of misrule since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary and point out one example of a Republican official, high or low, who ever asked to have his own budget cut \$1. Call the roll; there are no black satchels or Teapot Domes in our political closets.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 49, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. Appropriations under the Department of the Interior available for travel shall be available for expenses of the transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 73c-1), and regulations promulgated thereunder.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to certain matters and ask for clarification of them in order that I might know before final passage of this bill whether these figures are correct. As I understand the total request of this Department of the Budget was for \$349,756,568, as shown by the hearings on page 40. How much did the Budget finally allow? What was the total Budget estimate for this agency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The total Budget estimate, I may say to my good friend from Wisconsin, was \$180,317,266, as shown on page 47 of the report.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the Secretary of the Interior voluntarily cut his request by \$10,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct; he voluntarily cut his Department's estimate \$10,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. So that when the matter came before the gentleman's subcommittee for consideration it was how much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I misunderstood the gentleman. The original Budget estimate as submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by the Budget Bureau was about \$10,000,000 in excess of the present estimate—it would have been \$190,317,266 without the reduction recommended by the Secretary.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; and how much has the committee cut it in all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee brought the bill back here at \$162,634,845; and there have been some considerable cuts which will make it something above \$18,000,000 less than the Budget estimate.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman give me a figure showing the total cut on this bill below the Budget estimate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The total committee cut is \$17,682,421 below the Budget estimate and that, of course, was after the Secretary had taken his voluntary ten-million-odd cut the day after Pearl Harbor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention and also that of the Members that we have spent a number of days here, as we frequently do on appropriation bills, worrying about items, arguing and debating, trying to achieve some reductions in governmental expenditures. The committees always try to come in to show they have reduced the bill below the Budget estimate. This is a very laudable ambition. Let me call your attention to a fact, which you will find true in reference to almost every appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. I know it is true of those bills that are reported by the subcommittees of which I have the honor to be a member. I know it is true in this case as shown on page 34 of the hearings. This agency, in the current fiscal year, has received funds transferred to it from emergency funds heretofore given the President, totaling \$19,677,035. It received funds transferred from other agencies to this Department of about \$2,500,000 more.

Do not worry too much about these little cuts you are making. Do not think you are going to cripple this agency because you cut \$50,000 from some wildlife project, or some travel item or printing bill. You have made available in other appropriations millions upon millions of dollars of funds subject to the direction and control of the President. These agencies make a practice, when they have been cut by the Congress, and after we have fought for days and days trying to effect savings of going up to the Budget or to the President and requesting funds out of these so-called emergency funds. I dare say that if this agency is not different than the others, you will find there are deficit items for this agency already before the deficiency subcommittee. I find that in those appropriations being requested for the next

fiscal year for the labor and social-security agencies that they already tell us they have deficiency items before the deficiency subcommittee. To illustrate the point I am making I call attention to one agency for which the House appropriated \$1,080,000 last year, but which is actually spending \$1,980,000. Where did they get the money? Did the Congress pass upon that \$900,000 of additional money? Did the Appropriations Committee pass on that additional \$900,000 or the necessity for the additional personnel? No, we did not. They received those funds from "emergency funds." Let us not mislead ourselves. We are trying to save a few million dollars, and every effort should be made to continue the fight for economy. However, I want you to know, that under the despicable system of blank-check appropriations, a subservient Congress has so often resorted to, you open the way for the Executive to replace in the departmental funds every dollar we cut off. You know this practice is going on all of the time. If you want real, effective economy take back the power of Congress to control appropriations and put an end to the policy of blank-check appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, this is a recital, and I trust you will not be critical of the language I may use. I will promise you only one thing. If I begin to get sick, I will not say I am feeling "badly" unless the trouble develops in the ends of my fingers.

Some nights ago I was listening to the radio and heard one of the commentators say that it was being circulated around New York, and maybe somewhere else, that our Republican friends were letting it ooze around that they expected in 1944 to nominate General MacArthur for President of the United States. The thing disturbed me right smart.

The next morning when I came down the street I ran into one near the Capitol here whom I knew, and I was complaining somewhat about it. I said to him, "Since when did we understand that General MacArthur is a Republican? Why would he be born in Arkansas if he was ever going to be a Republican?" Now, there is Kansas and Vermont, maybe another State, but I cannot think of the name of it right now. "Oh," said my friend, "do not be disturbed about that. They are not going to try to take your man away from you."

"Well," I said, "let me remind you of a few things, my friend. Do you not remember when Woodrow Wilson went out and found Mr. Hoover, brought him into Washington, bought him a brand-new linen or duck suit, put it on him, combed his hair nice, bought him a beautiful sailor hat, and we thought he was ours and continued to think so until 1928? Then we looked around for him, and,

bless your soul, our Republican friends had gotten him and gone away with him—suit, hat, and all."

"There was nothing we could do about it. So they kept him through 1932," I told my friend, "and we did not raise any row about that. We did not even ask them to give us the hat back."

Then it came along to 1936 and in that year they behaved nice. They went over to Kansas and got their own candidate and nominated him. I was listening to the radio and heard the announcement and I thought, "Well, they are going to behave nice now; they have decided that a man cannot very well ride a horse sitting on him backward, nor operate an automobile to much advantage in reverse all the time, and we will not be bothered any more."

But I reminded my friend that I still had some grounds for my fears, because in 1940, lo and behold, they run over on our side and snatched Mr. Willkie before we could say a word about it.

My friend said, "You do not understand very well. You are not a man of much foresight. Do you know they are not going to nominate General MacArthur in 1944? That report is 1942 congressional campaign strategy they are putting on now."

I said that I had not thought of that, and asked him, "Are you a suspicious man or a prophet? I know one thing, you are like a great many women and a whole lot of men I know, you will have the last word; so, just go on and have it your way. I am gone."

And, too, I was reminded that General MacArthur has been in military life since he was 18 years old to date.

And as I went away, he was mumbling something. I looked back and listened to him, but I could not hear exactly what he was saying. It might have been something about Willkie.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the committee there is a saving made in this appropriation of \$17,600,000 over the 1943 Budget estimate. Of course, any one who knows the inner workings of the bureaucrats knows that figures such as we see here are of little or no value, so far as getting at the facts is concerned.

There is also shown here a reduction of roundly \$75,400,000 under the 1942 Budget estimate.

The 1942 Budget estimate was something like \$188,300,000. That was the original 1942 Budget estimate.

It will be noted in the report that the estimate is stated as being \$238,101,280. Since the original Budget estimate there have been something like five or six supplemental appropriations. There is pending now another supplemental appropriation bill for the 1942 Budget. Therefore, the savings as shown in this report have absolutely no significance whatsoever.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for the purchase or exchange of any motor-propelled passenger-

carrying vehicle if such purchase or exchange interferes with the priorities or quotas for military and naval purposes as determined, respectively, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 141, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill for printing and binding the total amount to be expended for printing, binding, duplicating, mimeographing, lithographing, or reproduction in any other form or by any other device, and including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals shall not exceed for every such purpose included in this bill the sum of \$450,000, and that the amounts estimated therefor and not expended within this limitation shall be recovered into the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma kindly invite the attention of the Chair to the legislation included in the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not sure I heard the exact wording of the amendment, but as I heard it, it stated "notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill," which would clearly indicate that it proposes to change the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Although, as indicated by the gentleman from Oklahoma, it does provide, "notwithstanding any other provisions carried in this bill," it relates to appropriations in the pending bill. The Chair is of the opinion that it is a limitation and is in order. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the printing and binding item is not all that is spent by the Department of the Interior for printing. I have a report that the amount of the investment in printing equipment in the Department of the Interior is as follows: Total replacement value of printing and duplicating equipment owned by the reporting unit—the Department of the Interior—\$836,213.45.

It seems to me there is a fundamental principle involved here. We should not go through the sham of voting an amount for printing and binding and then, without its being read as a separate item, know full well an expenditure of \$503,000 for this multigraphing and duplicating plant is hidden in this bill. If my colleagues on the subcommittee will look at page 47 of the committee print they will find a report of these duplicating expenses.

I hope the committee will adopt my amendment in the interest of honesty of government, because this expenditure will not help any soldier or sailor on any of the fronts throughout the world to protect himself. If we adopt this amend-



ment we shall be in much better shape to say, at least by the limitations expressed in here as to amounts, that we have saved that much manpower to protect the sons of the friends and neighbors we go back to face in our districts, and have done that much toward the winning of the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this further than to say that this Committee has voted on this same thing or a very similar item three or four times within the past couple of days. As I stated on the floor of the House yesterday, our friends across the aisle played a major role on this particular item of printing and binding. They practically wrote their ticket. Now, it seems they are dissatisfied with their own work and record. It will be recalled that I had to come to their rescue yesterday when they were wanting to disown and turn down their own handiwork. Again I beg Members on this side of the aisle to cross their fingers and give the O. K. to the fine work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our other colleagues over there in reducing to a minimum this important item for printing and binding.

Mr. Chairman, we have about finished this bill. Why the unnecessary delay? Why stall and play to the galleries? They are about empty now anyway. It has been a long, tedious battle. I have no complaints. Our lines have held except on two or three items. I feel that we have done a pretty good job. Of course, the Senate will review every item, and I am sure will make material changes. Let us finish the job and go home for the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 141, line 3, insert a new section, to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) Not more than 50 per centum of the appropriations herein made for non-defense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the temper of our people correctly, there is in this hour of intensifying peril an ominously growing concern among them over the failure of Congress to resist the selfish demands of the bureaucracy and other pressure groups and to put a stop to unconscionable, nonessential, nondefense expenditures.

This attitude of mind is not altogether a reaction of the war. It had been welling up for a long time before that. Naturally and justifiably the war has intensified this feeling. It appears the public is now becoming agitated over this mat-

ter to the point of demanding that we take effective action.

Indeed, we are blind if we cannot see this. Here we are in Congress asking every conceivable sacrifice of the public in order that we may win the war. Yet we fail utterly to stop the bureaucracy in its orgy of grabbing and spending—in its consumption and dissipation of resources sorely needed to stop the enemy.

Under these circumstances the people have a perfect right to complain that we are dilatory in our duty. We should not be surprised if their resentment against our continuing these huge appropriations for nonessential, nondefense expenditures should break out into angry demand that we stop them.

The bill before us calls for an appropriation to the Department of the Interior of roundly \$162,600,000 for 1943. The report shows this to be a reduction of approximately \$17,600,000 from the Budget estimates of 1943. This, of course, can mean nothing to anyone who understands the inner workings of the bureaucracy in setting up these estimates.

The report on this bill also shows a reduction of roundly \$75,400,000 from the appropriations for 1942 which can be misleading. The report shows the appropriation for 1942 to have been roundly \$238,100,000. The regular appropriation for the Interior Department for 1942 was about \$188,300,000. Something like six supplemental appropriations were made to this Department, bringing the figure up to \$238,100,000. Another supplemental appropriation for 1942, the amount of which I do not know, is now pending. From this it will be seen that the \$75,400,000 savings claimed in the report over the 1942 appropriations also has no meaning.

For the fourth day now I have been on this floor almost every minute listening attentively to the debates on this appropriation measure. A sincere effort has been made by certain members of the subcommittee to reduce nonessential, nondefense items with practically no success. A very few and almost insignificant piddling reductions have been made. We have seen practiced in the consideration of this bill the technique that is the normal mode of those who consistently resist reductions of all nonessential, non-defense appropriations. Formerly those people justified every appropriation in the name of recovery. Now they do so in the name of defense. In my opinion there is more boondoggling going on under the cloak of defense than there was under that of recovery.

Under the war conditions it is not enough to justify any appropriation merely on the basis that it is to be expended on a worthy project. The cardinal question in every proposed expenditure for carrying on normal nondefense activities is whether in wartime those activities can be dispensed with and the funds used more appropriately for war purposes. This one big question I am asking in respect to the appropriation before us, and I think every Congressman should do likewise. It is the real problem before us.

This bill, as stated, calls for an appropriation of, roundly, \$162,600,000. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], a member of the subcommittee, and I believe reputedly as well informed as any Member of Congress on this appropriation measure, stated, in answer to a question asked by myself, that in the neighborhood of \$70,000,000 of this appropriation will be required for power and defense measures. That would leave approximately \$92,600,000 for nondefense purposes. In the light of past Interior Department expenditures, plus the urgent prior needs for funds to carry on the war, I am convinced of the necessity of making a huge reduction in the non-defense portion of this appropriation.

In 1931, before the orgy of spending began, the cost of operation of the Interior Department was, roundly, \$66,100,000. That was for all purposes. It should be realized that the \$70,000,000 which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] stated should be considered as needed for power development will not all be expended for this one purpose. Much of it will go for improving and expanding irrigation and other nondefense projects. So that the \$70,000,000 will be used in a large measure for the same purposes as the \$66,100,000 was used in 1931.

Possibly Mr. LEAVY's estimate of the amount required for power development is too low, but that is not likely. But whatever may be the required amount in this appropriation for the development of power and other defense measures, it is my judgment the remainder of the appropriation which is to go for nondefense expenditures could be and should be reduced 50 percent. If this were done on the basis of \$70,000,000 being required for power development, it would mean a saving for war purposes of more than \$46,000,000. I am sure the amount of this reduction is needed more urgently for war production than it is for the purposes specified in the bill, however worthy they may be.

Then it should not be overlooked that most of the funds appropriated for non-defense expenditures are borrowed.

Drastic, shocking, I can hear many of you say, to propose such a reduction as my amendment calls for.

But is it any more drastic than depriving farmers, workingmen, and others of their automobiles; destroying small businesses by the tens of thousands; rationing of sugar, gas, and so forth, which is being extended to include more and more of the necessities; rationing even of razor blades—one a week per beard—so that the male of the genus homo in this land may soon also be looking like a Bolshevik?

Oh, yes; let the people bear all these burdens and sacrifices, but touch not anything that pertains to the bureaucracy. It must have its pound of flesh, war or no war.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are losing patience with Congress because they are not sure that it knows we are in war. They know we are at war and the reports they are receiving on its progress makes them fear it is at

present going against us, and I submit to you that it is time, and high time, for this Congress to take hold of this situation and let the people of this country know that we, too, are aware that our country is at war.

My amendment is proper and should be adopted. The people want nonessential, nondefense appropriations drastically reduced and I am sure they would approve of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have two more amendments. Would this close debate on those amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the Chair to understand that they would be offered as new sections?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the limitation would apply to them. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the gentleman is not too serious in offering an amendment of this kind and I shall not take the time to answer the gentleman. A day or two ago the same distinguished gentleman took several minutes to try to convince the House that the Budget estimate was only \$71,000,000. We finally, after much effort, convinced him, I think, he was in error then.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Sorry but I only have 2 minutes.

I made the statement in my opening remarks that the Interior Department is now engaged in by far the greatest war program of any other department of Government save the Army and the Navy. A few moments ago the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] referred to some of the so-called non-defense activities in this bill and gave a figure of \$19,000,000. On page 34 of the hearings you will find what that \$19,000,000 actually is or represents.

No. 1 is the emergency fund for the President, every bit of which is for national defense.

Then No. 2 is the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, every dollar of which is for defense. Then there is Office of Solid Fuels Coordination, every dollar for defense; Geological Survey, practically every dollar for defense. The Bureau of Mines has also now virtually become a war set-up. Way down toward the bottom of the list appears the appropriation for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. This might not be called actual national defense, but surely the Members would not want to eliminate that item at this time. I am sure my friend would not want to let the people of the Philippine Islands down right now. So it will be seen how utterly impractical such an amendment would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 5, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 141, line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 8-A. Not more than 75 percent of the appropriations herein made for nondefense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment was voted down. That amendment would have effected a saving of more than \$46,000,000. If it had passed there would have been that much more money to buy bombers and tanks and guns for MacArthur and his gallant fighters. There would have been that much less for the bureaucracy to waste and spend.

If that amendment had passed the people of this country would have been encouraged to believe that Congress has at last awakened to a realization that its responsibility in this crisis is something more and different than voting huge appropriations and catering to selfish pressure groups.

My second amendment would effect a saving of only about \$23,000,000. Should it pass the hopes of the people might be raised a little. For their sake and our own I hope it passes.

I want to answer the gentleman from Oklahoma who made the statement that I said the original estimate of the 1943 Budget was only \$71,000,000. If the gentleman will read the record he will see that the gentleman from Ohio merely asked to have some figures reconciled. I did not make any such statement as he has attributed to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; I cannot yield just now.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said he would not dignify my amendment by opposing it. I am not concerned whether he dignifies my amendment or not. I am now concerned only with what I believe the public wants done about the spending of so much money for nondefense purposes.

The gentleman from Oklahoma also said he was surprised that any Member should propose closing the national parks. Such a proposal should not be so surprising in view of the present rubber situation.

Mr. Chairman, there is talk of passing a law to limit the speed of automobiles to 40 miles an hour to save tires. When the tires now on the automobiles are worn out, there may be no more automobiles running. Certainly until we can see more daylight in the rubber situation than we see at present there will not be many automobiles running after they have worn out their present tires. I am not sure but that the proper thing to do would be to close those parks for the duration. If we want to save rubber here

is an opportunity to do so. Therefore, it is not a joking matter when we consider it from this standpoint.

I know there is a lot of ridicule and derision of the attempts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to bring about some economy here in these expenditures, but I say to you that people will be reading that man's economy record long after the record of the men who are deriding him has been forgotten. Vote for my amendment and give the people some hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 14, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 141, after line 3, insert a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 8 a. Not more than 90 percent of the appropriations herein made for nondefense purposes shall be expended."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. TABER. This amendment is a very modest one. It cuts only 10 percent of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Not the bill, only the nondefense expenditure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. How is the time to be allotted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, and 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that debate upon the bill close in 8 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my other two amendments having failed, I am offering a third. This one calls for a reduction of nondefense appropriations of only 10 percent, amounting to the piddling sum of \$9,000,000. I am fully aware that nothing short of a miracle can bring its passage, for I fear it will take a miracle to break the strong addiction to spending that afflicts this body. It seems that neither a public debt that promises to reach as high as any ever did, nor taxes that promise to be as burdensome as any ever laid on the backs of men not outright slaves, nor even the sound of tramp, tramp, tramp of our mortal enemy approaching our threshold can awaken this Congress to a realization of our responsibility in this crucial hour.

The chairman of the subcommittee stated he could not believe I am sincere in offering these amendments. Let me



assure him, if that be possible, that I am sincere.

I think the time is near at hand when the American people are going to effectively demand that we put an end to the spree of nondefense spending, that we check the greed of the bureaucrats, that we stop catering to pressure groups, that we quit our shilly-shallying, and get down to the hard business of winning this war.

I cannot believe this Congress fully realizes the gravity of our present situation, or we would not be piddling and fiddling as we are.

Nor can I blame the public for having the feeling toward Congress it has.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 37, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts for 3 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take advantage of this time to make inquiry from the majority leader. I understand he could tell us now the legislative program we may expect for the next few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, tomorrow we will consider the deficiency appropriation bill. After that there is nothing on the program for the next week and I know of nothing for the week after that. The only thing that might occur, but there is nothing on the program, is, in case it is ready, the conference report in connection with the civil functions of the War Department, but I assume that that will be disposed of without necessity of coming back here. Also the conference report on the housing law in connection with the District of Columbia, which went to conference today, provided that could be taken up without controversy. But there is nothing on the program for the next 2 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There has been a great deal of interest in the Smith-Vinson bill. When will it be ready for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], stated on the floor today that a large number of requests have been made by witnesses to appear and that a bill could not be reported out before April 13 if a bill were reported out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then any Member who went home during this period when there will be no legislative program ready would not be neglecting his duty as far as that bill is concerned? He could not help any in getting it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely not.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am very much opposed to any recess until some action is taken by the House on the suspension of the 40-hour law, the limitation of profits by war contractors, and other features of the Smith-Vinson bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is not a recess.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Well, it is a moratorium on action.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I would not say that. It is simply that the House has caught up with all of its legislation. Certainly at Easter time we take some recess out of respect to the holy days.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am one of those who wants the House to act at the very earliest possible moment upon the Smith-Vinson bill. I think it is imperative that we pass now legislation to speed up production in war industries and curtail enormous profits by some of these contractors. Of course, I realize that the House cannot consider that bill until the committee reports a bill. Do I understand that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. VINSON, which committee is considering the bill, has unequivocally stated that a bill cannot be reported to the House before April 13?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. That is the earliest date, if the committee reports a bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I have talked to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and urged the earliest possible action, and I believe the people have a right to expect Congress to act without any delay, and the safety of America demands it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder whether the gentleman from Texas, who has just expressed his concern about a possible recess, was prompted by reading the advertisements and literature that came to the desk of most of us within the last day or so?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to emphasize and concur in the statements of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]. The people are aroused and rightly so, and the importance of early action suspending the 40-hour week and preventing excess profits cannot be exaggerated. There is positively no doubt in the mind of any informed person that the overwhelming majority of the people, especially the people of the South, want immediate action on this 40-hour week and excess-profits matter. For many days I have been appealing for action without a delay and without a recess. Is there anything that we can now do to speed up action on that matter prior to the 13th of April?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, I would have to refer that to your own leadership.

Mr. MAHON. I would like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to answer that.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; there is nothing at all until the bill comes out of committee. There is no bill out of committee yet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to correct totals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### REPATRIATION OF AMERICANS ENLISTED IN SERVICE OF UNITED STATES ALLIED FORCES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers table the bill [S. 2339] to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. This bill, S. 2339, just passed by the other body, is a bill to permit approximately 20,000 American soldiers serving in the Army of Great Britain or her allies, who thereby gave up their American citizenship, to reclaim their American citizenship and join American forces now abroad.

We want to bring these men back. We can only bring them back by congressional action on a bill restoring their citizenship to them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why bring them back when we are sending troops overseas?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to answer the question?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The intent is not to bring them back to this country but simply to repatriate these former American citizens who expatriated themselves by joining the armed forces of foreign nations, mostly Canadian and English. They are to be allowed to recover their American citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance before the proper consular officer and joining the American forces immediately available. It is just a question of letting them fight under our own flag rather than under the flag of some allied nation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then it does not mean necessarily bringing them back to this country?

Mr. MASON. It does not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think this is extremely good legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 323 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149), entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 323. A person who, while a citizen of the United States and during the first or second World War, entered the military or naval service of any country at war with a country with which the United States was or is at war, who has lost citizenship of the United States by reason of any oath or obligation taken for the purpose of entering such service, or by reason of entering or serving in such armed forces, and who intends to reside permanently in the United States, may be naturalized by taking before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301, the oaths prescribed by section 335. Any such person who has lost citizenship of the United States during the second World War may, if he so desires, be naturalized by taking, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335. For the purposes of this section, the second World War shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939, and shall continue until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war. Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such diplomatic or consular officer or such court to the Department of State and to the Department of Justice."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 6717) were laid on the table.

#### CONTINUANCE OF 40-HOUR WEEK

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the letter I am about to read I received this morning from a soldier in the South, in camp there. He says:

Last night, after listening to a broadcast by Elmer Davis over the CBS network, I realized that we in the Army, and everyone in the South particularly, were being subjected to a merciless bombardment from every source against the continuance of the 40-hour week.

It started me thinking, too, and the reason for this letter is just a word of encouragement, since many in the Army resent being dragged into the arguments of those who would discontinue labor's opportunity to share equally in the results of the present expansion, and this expansion has been made possible through governmental expenditures.

It is a hell of a note to think that a great deal of their argument is based on patriotism since real patriotism should also consist in preserving a worker's advantages, though he may be in the Army. For victory will bring demobilization, and it would be an empty victory indeed if it meant a return to a civil life where there were only jobs with long hours and low pay.

I have received other letters—equally as expressive, and equally indignant—that the men in the Army are made to appear to have their brothers who are at the machines, supplying them with the tools of war.

These men who are now on the battlefields and in the camps, preparing for the day when they take their places before the enemy, all realize that they must return to civil life when this war shall have finished. They want to come back to the America they knew, not to a land of serfdom and overlords. They are depending on those who remain behind to keep faith with them. They want the progressive social legislation kept on our statute books. They had it put there in their demands for a square deal. They have received that square deal, and they are now fighting and dying to preserve that square deal. They do not want it wiped out while their backs are turned to home and their faces are turned toward the would-be destroyers of their homes.

They realize also, just as every sane person realizes, that these constant attacks are attacks on the men who are working for them, working to give them the most of the best equipment that can be produced, and give it to them in less time than the enemy can provide for its armies. They know that men who toil at the machines cannot be inspired by ridicule or the use of the bull whip. Those men at the machines have to realize that they are fighting for their America—for something worth while. They cannot feel that when they are being told hourly that the country is determined to wipe out everything they have—every last vestige of social progress that has made their lives decent and respectable.

These men on the construction jobs—in the factories and in the shops—realize far more than we who stand here and preach, what this war is all about. At

Wake Island these same men took up guns and hammers and anything else available the moment the emergency confronted them. They did not wait for authorizations, or reassignments, or appropriations. They did the job that had to be done. Many of them died. Many of them now languish in prison camps. Is their reward and congratulation to consist of this frenzied endeavor to cripple their futures by divesting them of the right to be acknowledged equals in the industrial life of the country to which they hope to return?

Men in and out of Congress rant and shout for the abolition of the 40-hour week, because it hampers production, yet every single one of them knows that it does not slow down production; that it is merely a standard, and that, in fact, almost without exception, war industries are working more than 40 hours per week—every week. The statement is heard over and over again—the people of the country want labor curtailed. Are not the men in the factories the people of the country? Are there a chosen few who are to be considered the people of the country? Then who are we who do the heavy work? Are not our conditions worthy of consideration? Those who perpetuate this clamor are doing no good. They are discouraging the efforts of the men at the tools, and they are serving the purpose of our enemies by stirring up class prejudice upon which they thrive, and which will some day return to haunt them. Keep it up and you may have the momentary feeling of victory, if your plans succeed, but you will later have these same men whom you now would cast down returning to mock you. They will tell you that their sons and their brothers fought in the trenches—that they did their jobs without all the clamor, and you will have nothing but the ashes of the great fire of enthusiasm that followed Pearl Harbor to guide you back to the days of oppression and sweatshops that some apparently pine for.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and to include therein a newspaper and also excerpts from a letter written by Mr. Donald Nelson of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain schedules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CANCELLATION OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order I had to address the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.



Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order I had to address the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FOLGER, Mr. JONKMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein certain schedules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter I received from the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a portion of an editorial from the news service of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from PM by its editor, Mr. Ingersoll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a speech broadcast by Elmer Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an article from the Tulsa (Okla.) World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial appearing in the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of Memphis, Tenn., entitled "The Ides of March—Not Gone."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter which I have written.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter received from a member of Parliament of Canada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ELLIOTT of California, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PACE, for 1 day, on account of illness.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6691. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, to further amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1536. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting a list of papers for disposal by him of certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1537. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Navy Personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Report No. 1956. Sixth supplemental report to accompany H. R. 6868. A bill making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1957. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1958. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1959. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. House Joint Resolution 291. Joint resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6869. A bill to provide for the decentralized settlement and payment of damage claims arising from activities of the Army, other than in foreign countries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6870. A bill authorizing the appointment of special clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 6871. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, with respect to corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6872. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce

against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to aid and expedite the prosecution of the war effort by raising revenue through the sale of war-participation tickets, to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 300. Resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to rename 20 thoroughfares for the Pan-American Republics; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to suspend the 40-hour work-week for duration of national emergency; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ANGELL introduced a bill (H. R. 6873) for the relief of Maude Leach, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2616. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Kiwanis Club, adopted March 16, 1942, for the guarding and protection of facilities essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2617. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 13 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, No. 1044, National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of House bill 6486, to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2618. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. Lena Martin, chairman of Local 3007, Corsicana, Tex., opposing Secretary Morgenthau's proposed legislation for tax on pension trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2619. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, urging the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake careful studies of economic problems arising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2620. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Bayside, N. Y., that the new time recently enacted to speed war production, commonly called by the sinister expression "war time," be renamed "victory time"; and if further change is made during the summer months, to call that period "victory summer time"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2621. Also, resolution of 300 independent tire dealers of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, that they implore relief from financial disaster under existing rubber regulations, and offer for consideration the fact that tire manufacturers, mass distributors, and petroleum outlets do not need their small share of new tire and recapping business in order to exist; conversely, the independent tire dealers of the Nation must receive all of the available new tire business and recapping tire service to continue in business; and that failure to direct the small amount of this business exclusively through the independent dealer will unquestionably result in the mortality of

approximately 60,000 independent tire dealers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2622. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Clerk read the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., March 28, 1942.

I hereby designate the Honorable JERE COOPER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.  
SAM RAYBURN.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art high and exalted, who hast promised to dwell with those who are of humble and penitent heart, we entreat Thee that we may be drawn to Thee by love and not by fear. Grant that we may be so consecrated to Thy service in mind and disposition, that the eyes of our hearts may behold Thy purity and the wonder of Thy creative power. The heart that knows Thy love is a sacred temple and all the babble of earth's confusion of voices is soon hushed into silence.

We praise Thee for the Christ, whose indomitable love and courage constrained Him to give His life for the redemption of the world. While the storms of rage and the thunders of hate were crashing over His head, His deepest promise was given: "My peace I leave with you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you." We pray that every throng may feel Thy presence, every cot of pain, the touch of Thy hand, and every endeavor realize in common life the brotherhood of man. Send forth Thy benediction, illuminating the minds of men, quieting their fears and hatreds and bringing them back to sanity and peace, confidence and faith in Thee. Almighty God, Oh bless America and may America bless God and most humbly realize that she will never be fit to rule until she is fit to serve. Do Thou help our President and all his counselors in their world-wide responsibilities, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6483) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr.

ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6736) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment No. 2 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on said amendment in disagreement, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House, of the following titles:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook; and  
H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

#### THE LATE RENÉ L. DEROUEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PLAUCHÉ].

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce the death of my personal friend and immediate predecessor, the Honorable René L. DeRouen. Mr. DeRouen died suddenly yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La.

Mr. René, as he was affectionately known by thousands of people in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, served in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction for about 14 years, voluntarily retiring at the expiration of his term last year.

At the time of his retirement he was chairman of the Public Lands Committee and a ranking member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

His able and conscientious services to the Nation, especially as a member of these two very important committees, are universally recognized and appreciated.

Mr. DeRouen was of a quiet and undemonstrative temperament. In his quiet way he had a great influence on his country and his fellowmen.

When I came to Washington as his successor, I found that all those who knew him, not only recognized his ability, sincerity, and earnestness, but were all proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Mr. DeRouen was a person of great devotion to his wife and his children. The State of Louisiana and particularly the Seventh District has lost a respected and beloved citizen, one who could ill be spared, especially in times like these.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, sometime yesterday morning in the city of Baton Rouge, La., René DeRouen passed into the Great Beyond. The end came